3 1761 06890915 9

RTheol
M

OF TORONTO LIB

THE

CHRISTIAN TREASURY;

A SELECTION OF
STANDARD TREATISES ON SUBJECTS OF
DOCTRINAL AND PRACTICAL CHRISTIANITY:

CONTAINING

1 MAGEE'S DISCOURSES AND DISSERTATIONS ON THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINES OF ATONEMENT AND SACRIFICE.
2 WITHERSPOON'S PRACTICAL TREATISE ON REGENERATION.
3 BOSTON'S CROOK IN THE LOT.
4 STUART'S LETTERS ON THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.
5 GUILD'S MOSES UNVEILED.
6 GUILD'S HARMONY OF ALL THE PROPHETS.
7 LESS'S AUTHENTICITY, UNCORRUPTED PRESERVATION, AND CREDIBILITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

EDITED BY THE

REV. T. S. MEMES, LL.D.

LONDON:
HENRY G. BOHN, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.
MDCCCXLIV.

98 A
78|11|90

DISCOURSES AND DISSERTATIONS

ON THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINES OF

ATONEMENT AND SACRIFICE;

AND ON

THE PRINCIPAL ARGUMENTS ADVANCED, AND THE MODE
OF REASONING EMPLOYED, BY THE OPPONENTS OF THOSE DOCTRINES
AS HELD BY THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH:

WITH

AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING SOME STRICTURES ON

MR BELSHAM'S ACCOUNT OF THE UNITARIAN SCHEME,

IN HIS REVIEW OF MR WILBERFORCE'S TREATISE.

BY THE LATE

MOST REV. WILLIAM MAGEE, D.D.

ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

EDINBURGH:
PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETOR, BY
A. & C. BLACK, BOOKSELLERS TO THE QUEEN.
ANDREW MOFFAT, 6, SKINNER STREET, SNOW HILL;
AND SIMPKIN, MARSHALL. & CO. LONDON.
MDCCCXLI.

EDINBURGH:
Printed by Andrew Shortrede, George IV. Bridge.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

WILLIAM CONYNGHAM PLUNKET.

In placing at the head of these sheets a name, to which the respect and the admiration of the public have attached so much celebrity, and in avowing, at the same time, that I have selected the name of a friend, with whom I have been united, almost from childhood, in the closest habits of intimacy, I am aware that I subject myself to the imputation of acting as much from a motive of pride as from a sentiment of affection. I admit the imputation to be well founded. To enjoy the happiness of having such a friend, and not to exult in the possession, would be not to deserve it. It is a pride which, I trust, may be indulged in without blame ; and the distinction of having been associated with a character so transcendently eminent for private worth, for public virtue, and for intellectual endowments, I shall always regard as one of the most honourable circumstances of my life.

But, independently of these considerations, the very nature of my subject supplies a reason for the choice which I have made. For I know not, in truth, to whom I could, with greater propriety, inscribe a work whose chief end is to expose false reasoning and to maintain true religion, than to one in whom the powers of just reasoning are so conspicuously displayed, and by whom the great principles of religion are so sincerely reverenced.

With these views, I trust that I shall stand excused by you, my dear sir, in having, without your knowledge, thus availed myself of the credit of your name. The following treatise, in which so many additions have been made to a former publication, as in some measure to entitle it to the appellation of a new work, I submit to your judgment ; well satisfied, that if it meet your approbation, it will not find an unfavourable reception from the public.

I am, my dear Sir,

With the truest attachment,

Your affectionate friend and servant,

The Author.

Trinity College, Dublin,
Sept, 21. 1809.

CONTENTS.

DISCOURSE I.—ON THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT, Page 7
DISCOURSE II.—ON THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE, . . 17

ILLUSTRATIONS AND EXPLANATORY DISSERTATIONS.

No Page
1. On the Pre-existence of Christ, and the species of arguments by which this article of the Christian Doctrine has been opposed, 23
2. Unitarian objections to the religious observance of stated days, 28
3. On the importance of the Doctrine of Redemption, . ib.
4. Pardon not necessarily consequent upon Repentance, 29
5. The sense entertained by mankind of the natural inefficacy of Repentance, proved from the history of human sacrifices, 30
6. On the multiplied operation of the Divine Acts, . 38
7. Deistical reasoning instanced in Chubb, ib.
8. On the consistency of Prayer with the Divine Immutability, 39
9. On the granting of the Divine forgiveness through a Mediator or Intercessor, 41
10. On Unitarians, or Rational Dissenters, 42
11. On the distinction between Unitarians and Socinians, 43
12. On the corruption of man's natural state, 44
13. On the misrepresentation of the Doctrine of Atonement by Unitarians, 48
14. On the disrespect of Scripture manifested by Unitarian writers, ib.
15. On the Heathen notions of merit entertained by Unitarian writers, 50
16. On Dr John Taylor's scheme of Atonement, ib.
17. The Doctrine of Atonement falsely charged with the presumption of pronouncing on the necessity of Christ's death, 52
18 On the mode of reasoning whereby the sufficiency of good works without mediation is attempted to be defended from Scripture, 54
19. The want of a discoverable connection between the means and the end, equally applies to every scheme of atonement, 55
20. On the Scripture phrase of our being Reconciled to God, 56
21. On the true distinction between the laying aside our enmity to God, and being reconciled to God, . 57
22. On the proofs from Scripture, that the sinner is the object of the Divine displeasure, ib.
23. Instance, from the book of Job, of Sacrifice being prescribed to avert God's anger, 58
24. On the Attribute of the Divine Justice, ib.
25. On the text in John, describing our Lord as "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world," 59
26. On the meaning of the word "propitiation" in the New Testament, 60
27. On the texts describing Christ's death as a Sacrifice for Sin, 61
28. On the word ΚΑΤΑΛΛΑΓΗ, translated "Atonement," in Rom. v. 11, 66
29. On the denial that Christ's death is described in Scripture as a Sin-offering, ib.
30. On the sense in which Christ is said in Scripture to have died for us, 67
31. On the pretence of figurative allusion in the sacrificial terms of the New Testament, 68
32. Arguments to prove the sacrificial language of the New Testament figurative, urged by H. Taylor and Dr Priestley, 69
33. On the sense entertained generally by all, and more especially instanced amongst the Jews, of the necessity of propitiatory expiation, ib.
34. On H. Taylor's objection of the want of a literal correspondence between the Mosaic sacrifice and the death of Christ, 78
35. On the arguments by which it is attempted to prove the Passover not to be a sacrifice, 79
36 On the meaning of the word translated "Atonement" in the Old Testament, 85
37. On the efficacy of the Mosaic atonement as applied to cases of moral transgression, 88
38. On the vicarious import of the Mosaic sacrifices, . 93
39. On the imposition of hands upon the head of the victim, 96
40. On the sufficiency of the proof of the propitiatory nature of the Mosaic sacrifices, independent of the argument which establishes their vicarious import, . 99
41. On the Divine institution of sacrifice; and the traces thereof discoverable in the heathen corruptions of the rite, ib.
42. On the death of Christ as a true propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of mankind, 103
43. On the inconsistency of the reasoning whereby the death of Christ is maintained to have been but figuratively a sacrifice, 124
44. On the nature of the sacrifice for sin, 125
45. On the effect of the Doctrine of Atonement in producing sentiments favourable to virtue and religion, . ib.
46. On the supposition that sacrifice originated in priestcraft, 126
47. On the supposition that the Mosaic sacrifice originated in human invention, 127
48. Sacrifices explained as gifts by various writers, . 130
49. Sacrifices considered as federal rites, 131
50. Bishop Warburton's theory of the origin of sacrifice, 133
51. The supposition that sacrifices originated in the idea of gifts, erroneous, ib.
52. On the date of the permission of animal food to man, 134
53. On the Divine origin of language, 137
54. On the natural unreasonableness of the sacrificial rite, 143
55. On the universality of sacrifice, ib
56. On the universality of the notion of the expiatory virtue of sacrifice, 144
57. On the objections against the supposition of the Divine institution of sacrifice, ib.
58. On the sacrifice of Abel, as evincing the Divine institution of sacrifice, 147
59. On the history and the book of Job, 148
60. On Grotius's strange misconception of the nature of Abel's sacrifice, 175
61. On the difference in the Divine reception of the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, 176
62. On the true meaning of the phrase, ΠΛΕΙΟΝΑ ΘΥΣΙΑΝ, attributed to the sacrifice of Abel, 177
63. On the nature and grounds of the faith evidenced by the sacrifice of Abel, 180
64. On the probable time and occasion of the institution of sacrifice, 181
65. On the true interpretation of the passage, Gen. iv. 7, containing God's expostulation with Cain, . 183
66. On the comparison between the sacrifice of Abel and that of Christ, 186
67. On the nature of sacrifice before the Law: tending to shew its confinement to animal sacrifice, except in the case of Cain, 187
68. On the disproportion between the effects of the Mosaic and the Christian sacrifices, ib.
69. On the correspondence between the sacrificial language of the Old Testament and that employed in the New to describe redemption by the death of Christ: and the original adaptation of the former to the subject of the latter, 189
Postscript to No. 69—On Bolingbroke and Hume, . 198
70. On the correspondence between the annual expiation under the Law, and the one great expiation under the Gospel, 208
71. On the nature and import of the ceremony of the scapegoat, 209
72. Socinian objections urged by a divine of the Established Church against the doctrine of the vicarious import of the Mosaic sacrifices, and against other doctrines of the Church of England, 210
73. The atonement by the sacrifice of Christ more strictly vicarious than that by the Mosaic sacrifices, whereby it was typified, 217
74. Concluding Number, 218

APPENDIX,

CONTAINING AN ACCOUNT OF THE UNITARIAN SCHEME, AS DESCRIBED BY MR BELSHAM, IN HIS REVIEW OF MR WILBERFORCE'S TREATISE; WITH OCCASIONAL STRICTURES ON THE LEADING ARGUMENTS ADVANCED IN THAT PUBLICATION, Page 219

PREFATORY ADDRESS.

TO THE STUDENTS IN DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

The following Discourses, originally composed with a view to your instruction, are now with the same design submitted to your more deliberate examination.

In these latter days Christianity seems destined to undergo a fiercer trial than it has for many centuries experienced. Its defenders are called upon, not merely to resist the avowed invader, who assails the citadel from without, but the concealed and treacherous foe, who undermines the works, or tampers with the garrison within. The temporising Christian, who, under the mask of liberality, surrenders the fundamental doctrines of his creed ; and the imposing Rationalist, who, by the illusions of a factitious resemblance, endeavours to substitute Philosophy for the Gospel ; are enemies even more to be dreaded than the declared and systematic Deist. The open attacks of the one, directed against the *Evidences* of Christianity, have but served to strengthen the great outworks of our faith, by calling to its aid the united powers of its adherents ; whilst the machinations of the others, secretly employed against the *Doctrines* of our religion, threaten, by eluding the vigilance, and lulling the suspicions, of its friends, to subvert through fraud what had been found impregnable by force. To aid these machinations, a modern and depraved philosophy hath sent abroad its pernicious sophistries, infecting the sources of morality, and enervating the powers of manly thought ; and, the better to effect these purposes, clad in those engaging colours which are peculiarly adapted to captivate the imaginations of young and ardent minds. Against arts and enemies such as these, the most strenuous exertions of all who value the religion of Christ are at this moment imperiously demanded.

In what manner to prepare for this conflict we are informed on high authority. We are to " take unto us the whole armour of God—having on the breast-plate of righteousness ; and our feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace : above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith we shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked : and taking the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." These are the arms which are to ensure us victory in the contest ; and without these arms we neither can nor ought to stand. A conspiracy the most deep and deadly has been formed against Christianity. The " powers of darkness" have combined their mightiest efforts. If, then, the sentinels of the Gospel sleep upon their posts, if they do not instantly rouse to its defence, they are guilty of the blackest treason to their heavenly Master. There is no room for truce or accommodation. The " Captain of our salvation" has declared, that " he that is not with him is against him." The force of this declaration is at this day peculiarly manifest. It is now become necessary, that a broad and distinct line should be drawn between those who truly acknowledge the authority of revelation, and those who, whilst they wear the semblance of Christians, but lend the more effectual support to the enemies of Christianity.

These reflections, though befitting all who profess the religion of Christ, press peculiarly on those who are destined to teach and to enforce his word. To you, my young friends, who look forward to the clerical office, they are important beyond description ; and, if allowed their due weight upon your minds, they cannot fail to stimulate to the most zealous and effectual exertions in your pursuit of sacred knowledge. Already, indeed, has a more enlivened spirit of religious inquiry been manifested amongst you. To promote that spirit, and to supply some additional security against the prevailing delusions of the day, these Discourses on the Doctrines of *Atonement* and *Sacrifice*,—doctrines against which, above all others, the Deist and the rationalizing Christian direct their attacks,—were originally delivered, and are now published.

The desire expressed for their publication by the existing divinity classes would have been long since complied with, but for the addition of certain arduous academic duties to the ordinary engagements of the author's collegiate situation. To those who are so well acquainted with the laborious employment which those duties and engagements necessarily impose, no apology can be requisite on the ground of delay. More than twelve months have elapsed since the greater part of these sheets were committed to the press ; and the prosecution of the subject has been unavoidably suspended during a considerable portion of the intervening period.

The form in which the work is now presented seems more to require explanation. The first design extended only to the publication of the two Discourses, with a few occasional and supplementary remarks :

and on this plan the sermons were sent to press. But on farther consideration, it appeared advisable to enter into a more accurate and extensive examination of the subject, even though a short text should thereby be contrasted with a disproportionate body of notes. The great vice of the present day is a presumptuous precipitancy of judgment; and there is nothing from which the cause of Christianity, as well as of general knowledge, has suffered more severely than from that impatience of investigation, and that confidence of decision upon hasty and partial views, which mark the literary character of an age undeservedly extolled for its improvements in reasoning and philosophy. A false taste in morals is naturally connected with a false taste in literature; and the period of vicious dissipation is not likely to prove the era of dispassionate and careful inquiry. There is, however, no short way to truth. The nature of things will not accommodate itself to the laziness, the interests, or the vices of men. The paths which lead to knowledge are unalterably fixed, and can be traced only by slow and cautious steps.

From these considerations, it was judged expedient to submit the subject of these discourses, and the crude and superficial reasonings which have of late been exercised upon it, to a stricter and more minute test of inquiry. For this purpose, the present plan has been adopted as best suited to that exactness of critical investigation which is due to the importance of the subject, and as the most fitly calculated to direct the thoughts of the student to the most useful topics of inquiry, and the most profitable sources of information. Such a plan, I have little doubt, will be favourably received by those whose minds, trained in the habits of close deduction, and exercised in the researches of accurate science, cannot but be readily disposed to accept, in the place of general assertion and plausible declamation, a careful review of facts, and a cautious examination of Scripture.

One circumstance, which is of no mean value in the method here pursued, is, that it enables us, without interrupting the thread of inquiry, to canvass and appreciate the pretensions of certain modern writers, whose high tone of self-admiration, and loud vauntings of superior knowledge, have been but too successful in obtaining for them a partial and temporary ascendency in public opinion; and who have employed the influence derived from that ascendency to weaken the truths of Christianity, and to subvert the dearest interests of man. I trust that you, my young readers, will see enough in the Illustrations and Explanatory Dissertations accompanying these Discourses, to convince you of the emptiness of their claims to that superiority, which, did they possess it, would be applied to purposes so injurious. You will probably see sufficient reason to pronounce, that their pretensions to philosophic distinction, and their claims to critical pre-eminence, stand on no better grounds than their assumption of the exclusive profession of a pure Christianity. The confident and overbearing language of such men you will then regard as you ought: and, from the review of their reasonings, and the detail of their religious opinions, you will naturally be led to feel the full value of the duly regulated discipline of the youthful understanding, in those severer exercises of scientific study, which give vigour to the intellect, and steadiness to the judgment; and the still greater value of that early reverence for the mysterious sublimities of religion, which teaches the humility becoming man's highest powers when directed to the yet higher things of God. The half learning of modern times has been the fruitful parent of multiplied evils: and it is not without good cause, that the innovating theorist of the present day makes it his first object to abridge the work of education, and, under the pretence of introducing a system of more immediate practical utility, to exclude that wholesome discipline, and regular institution, which are essential to conduct the faculties of the young mind to sound and manly strength.

I cannot conclude this prefatory address without indulging in the gratifying reflection, that, whilst the deceptions of wit and the fascinations of eloquence, combined with a wily sophistry and an imposing confidence, have but too frequently produced their pernicious effects, to the detriment of a true Christian faith, on the minds of the inexperienced and unreflecting; these audacious attempts have seldom found, in this place, any other reception than that of contempt and aversion. And with true pleasure I feel myself justified in pronouncing with confidence, that, so long as the students of this seminary, intended for the office of the ministry, continue to evince the same serious attention to religious subjects which has of late years so honourably distinguished numbers of your body, and so profitably rewarded the zealous labours of your instructors in sacred literature, Christianity will have little to fear in this land from such attempts.

That you may gloriously persevere in these laudable efforts to attain the most useful of all learning, and in the conscientious endeavour to qualify yourselves for the due discharge of the most momentous of all duties; that so the work of God may not suffer in your hands; and that, being judged fit dispensers of that "wisdom which is from above," you may hereafter be enabled to "turn many to righteousness," and finally to obtain the recompense of the "good and faithful servants" of Christ, is the ardent wish and prayer of your very sincere friend,

THE AUTHOR.

April 22, 1801.

TWO DISCOURSES

ON THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINES OF

ATONEMENT AND SACRIFICE;

DELIVERED IN THE CHAPEL OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN, ON
GOOD FRIDAY, IN THE YEARS 1798 AND 1799.

DISCOURSE I.

> "But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called — Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." 1 Cor. i. 23, 24.

That the sublime mystery of the Redemption should have escaped the comprehension both of the Jew and of the Greek; that a crucified Saviour should have given offence to the worldly expectant of a triumphant Messiah, whilst the proud philosopher of the schools turned with disdain from the humiliating doctrine which proclaimed the insufficiency of human reason, and threatened to bend its aspiring head before the foot of the Cross, — were events which the matured growth of national prejudice, on the one hand, and the habits of contentious discussion, aided by a depraved moral system, on the other, might, in the natural course of things, have been expected to produce. That the Son of God had descended from heaven; that he had disrobed himself (No. I.) of the glory which he had with the Father before the world began; that he had assumed the form of the humblest and most degraded of men; that, submitting to a life of reproach, and want, and sorrow, he had closed the scene with a death of ignominy and torture; and that, through this voluntary degradation and suffering, a way of reconciliation with the Supreme Being had been opened to the whole human race, and an atonement made for those transgressions, from the punishment of which unassisted reason could have devised no means of escape, — these are truths which prejudice and pride could not fail, at all times, to have rejected; and these are truths to which the irreligion and self-sufficiency of the present day oppose obstacles not less insurmountable than those which the prejudice of the Jew, and the philosophy of the Greek, presented in the age of the apostle. For at this day, when we boast a wider diffusion of learning, and more extensive acquirements of moral knowledge, do we not find these fundamental truths of revelation questioned? Do we not see the haughtiness of lettered scepticism presuming to reject the proffered terms of salvation, because it cannot trace, with the finger of human science, the connection between the cross of Christ and the redemption of man? But to these vain and presumptuous aspirings after knowledge placed beyond human reach, we are commanded to preach Christ crucified: which, however it may, to the self-fancied wise ones of this world, appear as foolishness, is yet, to those who will humble their understanding to the dispensations of the Almighty, the grandest display of the divine perfections —"Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

To us also, my brethren, who profess a conviction of this truth, and who are called on by the return of this day, (No. II.) more particularly to recollect the great work of salvation, wrought out for us by the memorable event which it records, it may not be unprofitable to take a short view of the objections that have been urged against this fundamental doctrine (No. III.) of our religion; that so we may the better discern those snares which beset the Christian path, and that, being guarded against the obstructions which are insidiously raised against that true and gospel faith, whereby alone we can hope for acceptance and happiness, we may be able to place the great pillar of our hopes upon a basis which no force can shake, and no art can undermine.

In the consideration of this subject, which every Christian must deem most highly deserving the closest examination, our attention should be directed to two different classes of objectors,—those who deny the necessity of any mediation whatever, and those who question the particular nature of that mediation which has been appointed. Whilst the Deist, on the one hand, ridicules the very notion of a Mediator; and the philosophising Christian, on the other, fashions it to his own hypothesis; we are called on to vindicate the word of truth from the injurious attacks of both, and carefully to secure it, not only against the open assaults of its avowed enemies, but against the more dangerous misrepresentations of its false or mistaken friends.

The objections which are peculiar to the former are, upon this subject, of the same description with those which they advance against every other part of revelation; bearing with equal force against the system of Natural Religion, which they support, as against the doctrines of Revealed Religion, which they oppose. And, indeed, this single circumstance, if weighed with candour and reflection — that is, if the Deist were truly the philosopher he pretends to be — might suffice to convince him of his error. For the closeness of the analogy between the works of Nature and the word of the Gospel being found to be such, that every blow which is aimed at the one rebounds with undiminished force against the other, the conviction of their common origin must be the inference of unbiassed understanding.

Thus, when, in the outset of his argument, the Deist tells us, that, as obedience must be the object of God's approbation, and disobedience the ground of his displeasure, it must follow, by natural consequence, that, when men have transgressed the divine commands, repentance and amendment of life will place them in the same situation as if they had never offended; he does not recollect, that actual experience of the course of nature directly contradicts the assertion, and that, in the common occurrences of life, the man who, by intemperance and voluptuousness, has injured his character, his fortune, and his health, does not find himself instantly restored to the full enjoyment of these blessings on repenting of his past misconduct, and determining on future amendment. Now, if the attributes of the Deity demand that the punishment should not outlive the crime, on what ground shall we justify this temporal dispensation? The difference in degree cannot affect the question in the least. It matters not whether the punishment be of long or of short duration; whether in this world or in the next. If the justice or the goodness of God require that punishment should not be inflicted when repentance has taken place, it must be a violation of those attributes to permit any punishment whatever, the most slight, or the most transient. Nor will it avail to say, that the evils of this life attendant upon vice are the effects of an established constitution, and follow in the way of natural consequence. Is not that established constitution itself the effect of the divine decree? and are not its several operations as much the appointment of its Almighty Framer, as if they had individually flowed from his immediate direction? But, besides, what reason have we to suppose that God's treatment of us in a future state will not be of the same nature as we find it in this — according to established rules, and in the way of natural consequence? Many circumstances might be urged, on the contrary, to evince the likelihood that it will. But this is not necessary to our present purpose. It is sufficient that the Deist cannot prove that it will not. Our experience of the present state of things evinces, that indemnity is not the consequence of repentance here: can he adduce a counter-experience to shew that it will hereafter? The justice and goodness of God are not, then, necessarily concerned, in virtue of the sinner's repentance, to remove all evil consequent upon sin in the next life; or else the arrangement of events in this has not been regulated by the dictates of justice and goodness. If the Deist admits the latter, what becomes of his Natural Religion?

Now let us inquire whether the conclusions of abstract reasoning will coincide with the deductions of experience. If obedience be at all times our duty, in what way can present repentance release us from the punishment of former trangressions? (No. IV.) Can repentance annihilate what is past? Or, can we do more, by present obedience, than acquit ourselves of present obligation? Or, does the contrition we experience, added to the positive duties we discharge, constitute a surplusage of merit, which may be transferred to the reduction of our former demerit? And is the justification of the philosopher, who is too enlightened to be a Christian, to be built, after all, upon the absurdities of supererogation? "We may as well affirm," says a learned divine, "that our former obedience atones for our present sins, as that our present obedience makes amends for antecedent transgressions." And it is surely with a peculiar ill grace, that this sufficiency of repentance is urged by those who deny the possible efficacy of Christ's mediation; since the ground on which they deny the latter, equally serves for the rejection of the former: the necessary connection between the merits of one being, and the acquittal of another, not being less conceivable than that which is believed to subsist between obedience at one time, and the forgiveness of disobedience at another.

Since, then, upon the whole, experience (as far as it extends) goes to prove the natural inefficacy of repentance to remove the effects of past transgressions ; and the abstract reason of the thing can furnish no link, whereby to connect present obedience with forgiveness of former sins ; it follows, that, however the contemplation of God's infinite goodness and love might excite some faint hope that mercy would be extended to the sincerely penitent, the animating certainty of this momentous truth, without which the religious sense can have no place, can be derived from the express communication of the Deity alone, (No. V.)

But it is yet urged by those who would measure the proceedings of divine wisdom by the standard of their own reason, that, admitting the necessity of a revelation on this subject, it had been sufficient for the Deity to have made known to man his benevolent intention ; and that the circuitous apparatus of the scheme of redemption must have been superfluous for the purpose of rescuing the world from the terrors and dominion of sin ; when this might have been effected, in a way infinitely more simple and intelligible, and better calculated to excite our gratitude and love, merely by proclaiming to mankind a free pardon, and perfect indemnity, on condition of repentance and amendment.

To the disputer, who would thus prescribe to God the mode by which he may best conduct his creatures to happiness, we might, as before, reply, by the application of his own argument to the course of ordinary events ; and we might demand of him to inform us, wherefore the Deity should have left the sustenance of life depending on the tedious process of human labour and contrivance, in rearing from a small seed, and conducting to the perfection fitting it for the use of man, the necessary article of nourishment, when the end might have been at once accomplished by its instantaneous production. And will he contend, that bread has not been ordained for the support of man, because, instead of the present circuitous mode of its production, it might have been rained down from heaven, like the manna in the wilderness? On grounds such as these, the Philosopher (as he wishes to be called) may be safely allowed to object to the notion of forgiveness by a Mediator.

With respect to every such objection as this, it may be well, once for all, to make this general observation. We find, from the whole course of nature, that God governs the world, not by independent acts, but by connected system. The instruments which he employs, in the ordinary works of his providence, are not physically necessary to his operations. He might have acted without them if he pleased. He might, for instance, have created all men, without the intervention of parents : but where then had been the beneficial connection between parents and children ; and the numerous advantages resulting to human society, from such connection? The difficulty lies here : the uses, arising from the connections of God's acts may be various ; and such are the pregnancies of his works, that a single act may answer a prodigious variety of purposes. Of these several purposes we are, for the most part, ignorant : and from this ignorance are derived most of our weak objections against the ways of his providence ; whilst we foolishly presume, that, like human agents, he has but one end in view, (No. VI.)

This observation we shall find of material use, in our examination of the remaining arguments adduced by the Deist, on the present subject. And there is none to which it more forcibly applies than to that, by which he endeavours to prove the notion of a Mediator to be inconsistent with the divine immutability. It is either, he affirms, (No. VII.) agreeable to the will of God, to grant salvation on repentance, and then he will grant it without a Mediator ; or it is not agreeable to his will, and then a Mediator can be of no avail, unless we admit the mutability of the divine decrees.

But the objector is not, perhaps, aware how far this reasoning will extend. Let us try it in the case of prayer. All such things as are agreeable to the will of God must be accomplished, whether we pray or not ; and, therefore, our prayers are useless, unless they be supposed to have a power of altering his will. And, indeed, with equal conclusiveness it might be proved, that repentance itself must be unnecessary. For, if it be fit that our sins should be forgiven, God will forgive us without repentance ; and if it be unfit, repentance can be of no avail, (No. VIII.)

The error in all these conclusions is the same. It consists in mistaking a conditional for an absolute decree, and in supposing God to ordain an end unalterably, without any concern as to the intermediate steps whereby that end is to be accomplished. Whereas the manner is sometimes as necessary as the act proposed ; so that if not done in that particular way, it would not have been done at all. Of this observation abundant illustration may be derived, as well from natural, as from revealed religion. "Thus, we know, from natural religion, that it is agreeable to the will of God, that the distresses of mankind should be relieved ; and yet we see the destitute, from a wise constitution of Providence, left to the precarious benevolence of their fellow-men ; and if not relieved by them, they are not relieved at all. In like manner, in Revelation, in the case of Naaman the Syrian, we find that God was willing he should be healed of his leprosy; but yet he was not willing that it should be done, except in one particular manner. Abana and Pharpar were as famous as any of the rivers of Israel. Could he not wash in them, and be clean? Certainly he might, if the design of God had been no more than to heal him. Or it might have been done without any washing at all. But the healing was not the only design of God, nor the most important. The manner of the cure was of more consequence in the moral design of God, than the cure itself: the effect being produced, for the sake of manifesting, to the whole kingdom of Syria, the great power of the God of Israel, by which the cure was performed." And, in like manner, though God willed that the penitent sinner should receive forgiveness, we may see good reason, why, agreeably to his usual proceeding, he might will it to be granted in one particular manner only,—through the intervention of a Mediator, (No. IX.)

Although, in the present stage of the subject, in which we are concerned with the objections of the Deist, the argument should be confined to the deductions of natural reason; yet I have added this instance from Revelation, because, strange to say, some who assume the name of Christians, and profess not altogether to discard the written word of Revelation, adopt the very principle which we have just examined. For what are the doctrines of that description of Christians, (No. X.) in the sister kingdom, who glory in having brought down the high things of God to the level of man's understanding? — That Christ was a person sent into the world to promulgate the will of God; to communicate new lights on the subject of religious duties; by his life, to set an example of perfect obedience; by his death, to manifest his sincerity; and by his resurrection, to convince us of the great truth which he had been commissioned to teach, — our rising again to future life. This, say they, is the sum and substance of Christianity. It furnishes a purer morality, and a more operative enforcement; its morality more pure, as built on juster notions of the divine nature; and its enforcement more operative, as founded on a certainty of a state of retribution, (No XI.) —And is, then, Christianity nothing but a new and more formal promulgation of the religion of nature? Is the death of Christ but an attestation of his truth? And are we, after all, left to our own merit for acceptance; and obliged to trust, for our salvation, to the perfection of our obedience? Then, indeed, has the great Author of our religion in vain submitted to the agonies of the cross; if, after having given to mankind a law which leaves them less excusable in their transgressions, he has left them to be judged by the rigour of that law, and to stand or fall by their own personal deserts.

It is said, indeed, that as by this new dispensation the certainty of pardon, on repentance, has been made known, mankind has been informed of all that is essential in the doctrine of mediation. But, granting that no more was intended to be conveyed than the sufficiency of repentance, yet it remains to be considered in what way that repentance was likely to be brought about. Was the bare declaration, that God would forgive the repentant sinner, sufficient to ensure his amendment? Or was it not rather calculated to render him easy under guilt, from the facility of reconciliation? What was there to alarm, to rouse, the sinner from the apathy of habitual transgression? What was there to make that impression which the nature of God's moral government demands? Shall we say, that the grateful sense of divine mercy would be sufficient; and that the generous feelings of our nature, awakened by the supreme goodness, would have secured our obedience? that is, shall we say, that the love of virtue, and of right, would have maintained man in his allegiance? And have we not, then, had abundant experience of what man can do, when left to his own exertions, to be cured of such vain and idle fancies? What is the history of man, from the creation to the time of Christ, but a continual trial of his natural strength? And what has been the moral of that history, but that man is strong only as he feels himself weak? — strong, only as he feels that his nature is corrupt, and, from a consciousness of that corruption, is led to place his whole reliance upon God? What is the description, which the Apostle of the Gentiles has left us, of the state of the world at the coming of our Saviour? — "Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful — who, knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them," (Rom. i. 29—32.

Here were the fruits of that natural goodness of the human heart, which is the favourite theme and fundamental principle with that class of Christians with whom we are at present concerned. And have we not, then, had full experiment of our natural powers? (No. XII.) And shall we yet have the madness to fly back to our own sufficiency, and our own merits, and to turn away from that gracious support, which is offered to us through the mediation of Christ? No: lost as men were, at the time Christ appeared, to all sense of true religion; lost as they must be to it, at all times, when left to a proud confidence in their own sufficiency; nothing short of a strong and salutary terror could awaken them to virtue. Without some striking expression of God's abhorrence of sin, which might work powerfully on the imagination and on the heart, what could prove a sufficient counteraction to the violent impulse of natural passions? what, to the entailed depravation, which the history of man, no less than the voice of Revelation, pronounces to have infected the whole human race? Besides, without a full and adequate sense of guilt, the very notion of forgiveness, as it relates to us, is unintelligible. We can have no idea of forgiveness, unless conscious of something to be forgiven. Ignorant of our forgiveness, we remain ignorant of that goodness which confers it. And thus, without some proof of God's hatred for sin, we remain unacquainted with the greatness of his love.

The simple promulgation, then, of forgiveness on repentance, could not answer the purpose. Merely to know the condition, could avail nothing. An inducement, of sufficient force to ensure its fulfilment, was essential. The system of sufficiency had been fully tried, to satisfy mankind of its folly. It was now time to introduce a new system, the system of humility. And for this purpose, what expedient could have been devised more suitable, than that which has been adopted? — the sacrifice of the Son of God, for the sins of men: proclaiming to the world, by the greatness of the ransom, the immensity of the guilt, (No. XIII;) and thence, at the same time, evincing, in the most fearful manner, God's utter abhorrence of sin, in requiring such expiation; and the infinity of his love, in appointing it.

To this expedient for man's salvation, though it be the clear and express language of Scripture, I have as yet sought no support from the authority of Scripture itself. Having hitherto had to contend with the Deist, who denies all Revelation, and the pretended Christian, who, rationalising away its substance, finds it a mere moral system, and can discover in it no trace of a Redeemer, to urge the declarations of Scripture, as to the particular nature of redemption, would be to no purpose. Its authority, disclaimed by the one and evaded by the other, each becomes unassailable on any ground, but that which he has chosen for himself — the ground of general reason.

But we come now to consider the objections of a class of Christians, who, as they profess to derive their arguments from the language and meaning of Scripture, (No. XIV.) will enable us to try the subject of our discussion by the only true standard, the word of Revelation. And, indeed, it were most sincerely to be wished, that the doctrines of Scripture were at all times collected purely from the Scripture itself; and that preconceived notions, and arbitrary theories, were not first to be formed, and then the Scripture pressed into the service of each fanciful dogma. If God has vouchsafed a Revelation, has he not thereby imposed a duty of submitting our understandings to its perfect wisdom? Shall weak, short-sighted man presume to say — "If I find the discoveries of Revelation correspond to my notions of what is right and fit, I will admit them: but if they do not, I am sure they cannot be the genuine sense of Scripture: and I am sure of it on this principle, that the wisdom of God cannot disagree with itself?" That is, to express it truly, that the wisdom of God cannot but agree with what this judge of the actions of the Almighty deems it wise for him to do. The language of Scripture must, then, by every possible refinement, be made to surrender its fair and natural meaning, to this predetermination of its necessary import. But the word of Revelation being thus pared down to the puny dimensions of human reason, how differs the Christian from the Deist? The only difference is this: that whilst the one denies that God hath given us a Revelation, the other, compelled by evidence to receive it, endeavours to render it of no effect. But in both, there is the same self-sufficiency, the same pride of understanding, that would erect itself on the ground of human reason, and that disdains to accept the divine favour on any conditions but its own. In both, in short, the very characteristic of a Christian spirit is wanting — *Humility*. For in what consists the entire of Christianity but in this — that, feeling an utter incapacity to work out our own salvation, we submit our whole selves, our hearts and our understandings, to the divine disposal; and, relying on God's gracious assistance, ensured to our honest endeavours to obtain it, through the mediation of Christ Jesus, we look up to him, and to him alone, for safety? Nay, what is the very notion of religion, but this humble reliance upon God? Take this away, and we become a race of independent beings, claiming, as a debt, the reward of our good works, (No. XV;) a sort of contracting party with the Almighty, contributing nought to his glory, but anxious to maintain our own independence, and our own rights. And is it not to subdue this rebellious spirit, which is necessarily at war with Virtue and with God, that Christianity has been introduced? Does not every page of Revelation peremptorily pronounce this? And yet, shall we exercise this spirit, even upon Christianity itself? Assuredly, if our pride of understanding, and self-sufficiency of reason, are not made to prostrate themselves before the awfully mysterious truths of Revelation; if we do not bring down the rebellious spirit of our nature, to confess that the wisdom of man is but foolishness with God, we may bear the name of

Christians, but we want the essence of Christianity.

These observations, though they apply, in their full extent, only to those who reduce Christianity to a system purely rational, yet are, in a certain degree, applicable to the description of Christians, whose notion of redemption we now come to consider. For what but a preconceived theory, to which Scripture had been compelled to yield its obvious and genuine signification, could ever have led to the opinion, that, in the death of Christ, there was no expiation for sin; that the word sacrifice has been used by the writers of the New Testament merely in a figurative sense; and that the whole doctrine of the Redemption amounts but to this—"that God, willing to pardon repentant sinners, and at the same time willing to do it only in that way which would best promote the cause of virtue, appointed that Jesus Christ should come into the world; and that He, having taught the pure doctrines of the Gospel, having passed a life of exemplary virtue, having endured many sufferings, and finally death itself, to prove his truth, and perfect his obedience; and having risen again, to manifest the certainty of a future state; has, not only by his example, proposed to mankind a pattern for imitation; but has, by the merits of his obedience, obtained, through his intercession, as a reward, a kingdom or government over the world, whereby he is enabled to bestow pardon, and final happiness upon all who will accept them, on the terms of sincere repentance?" (No. XVI.) That is, in other words, we receive salvation through a Mediator: the mediation conducted through intercession: and that intercession successful, in recompense of the meritorious obedience of our Redeemer.

Here, indeed, we find the notion of redemption admitted: but in setting up, for this purpose, the doctrine of pure intercession in opposition to that of atonement, we shall perhaps discover, when properly examined, some small tincture of that mode of reasoning, which, as we have seen, has led the modern Socinian to contend against the idea of Redemption at large; and the Deist, against that of Revelation itself.

For the present, let us confine our attention to the objections which the patrons of this new system bring against the principle of atonement, as set forth in the doctrines of that Church to which we more immediately belong. As for those which are founded in views of general reason, a little reflection will convince us, that there is not any, which can be alleged against the latter, that may not be urged, with equal force, against the former: not a single difficulty, with which it is attempted to encumber the one, that does not equally embarrass the other. This having been evinced, we shall then see how little reason there was for relinquishing the plain and natural meaning of Scripture; and for opening the door to a latitude of interpretation, in which it is but too much the fashion to indulge at the present day, and which, if persevered in, must render the word of God a nullity.

The first and most important of the objections we have now to consider, is that which represents the doctrine of atonement as founded on the divine implacability—in as much as it supposes, that, to appease the rigid justice of God, it was requisite that punishment should be inflicted; and that, consequently, the sinner could not by any means have been released had not Christ suffered in his stead, (No. XVII.) Were this a faithful statement of the doctrine of atonement, there had, indeed, been just ground for the objection. But that this is not the fair representation of candid truth, let the objector feel, by the application of the same mode of reasoning to the system which he upholds. If it was necessary to the forgiveness of man, that Christ should suffer; and through the merits of his obedience, and as the fruit of his intercession, obtain the power of granting that forgiveness; does it not follow, that, had not Christ thus suffered, and interceded, we could not have been forgiven? And has he not then, as it were, taken us out of the hands of a severe and strict Judge; and is it not to him alone that we owe our pardon? Here the argument is exactly parallel, and the objection of implacability equally applies. Now what is the answer? "That although it is through the merits and intercession of Christ, that we are forgiven; yet these were not the procuring cause, but the means by which God, originally disposed to forgive, thought it right to bestow his pardon." Let then the word intercession be changed for sacrifice, and see whether the answer be not equally conclusive.

The sacrifice of Christ was never deemed by any, who did not wish to calumniate the doctrine of atonement, to have made God placable; but merely viewed as the means, appointed by divine wisdom, through which to bestow forgiveness. And agreeably to this, do we not find this sacrifice every where spoken of, as ordained by God himself?—"God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," (John, iii. 16;) and, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins," (1 John, iv. 10.;) and again we are told, that "we are redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish, and without spot—who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world," (1 Pet. 1. 18—20;) and again, that Christ is "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," (Rev. xiii. 8.) Since, then, the notion of the efficiency of the sacrifice of Christ, contained in the doctrine of atonement, stands precisely on the same foundation with that of pure intercession — merely as the means whereby God has thought fit to grant his favour and gracious aid to repentant sinners, and to fulfil that merciful intention which he had at all times entertained towards his fallen creatures; and since, by the same sort of representation, the charge of implacability in the Divine Being is as applicable to the one scheme as to the other; that is, since it is a calumny most foully cast upon both; we may estimate with what candour this has been made, by those who hold the one doctrine, the fundamental ground of their objections against the other. For it is on the ground of the expression of God's unbounded love to his creatures every where through Scripture, and of his several declarations that he forgave them freely, that they principally contend, that the notion of expiation by the sacrifice of Christ, cannot be the genuine doctrine of the New Testament, (No. XVIII.)

But still it is demanded, "In what way can the death of Christ, considered as a sacrifice of expiation, be conceived to operate to the remission of sins, unless by the appeasing a Being, who otherwise would not have forgiven us?"—To this the answer of the Christian is,— "I know not, nor does it concern me to know, in what manner the sacrifice of Christ is connected with the forgiveness of sins: it is enough that this is declared by God to be the medium through which my salvation is effected. I pretend not to dive into the councils of the Almighty. I submit to his wisdom: and I will not reject his grace, because his mode of vouchsafing it is not within my comprehension." But now let us try the doctrine of pure intercession by this same objection. It has been asked, how can the sufferings of one being be conceived to have any connection with the forgiveness of another? Let us likewise inquire, how the meritorious obedience of one being can be conceived to have any connection with the pardon of the transgressions of another, (No. XIX.): or whether the prayer of a righteous being in behalf of a wicked person can be imagined to have more weight in obtaining forgiveness for the transgressor, than the same supplication, seconded by the offering up of life itself, to procure that forgiveness? The fact is, the want of discoverable connection has nothing to do with either. Neither the sacrifice, nor the intercession, has, so far as we can comprehend, any efficacy whatever. All that we know, or can know of the one, or of the other, is, that it has been appointed as the means by which God has determined to act with respect to man. So that to object to the one, because the mode of operation is unknown, is not only giving up the other, but the very notion of a Mediator; and, if followed on, cannot fail to lead to pure Deism, and, perhaps, may not stop even there.

Thus we have seen to what the general objections against the doctrine of atonement amount. The charges of divine implacability, and of inefficacious means, we have found to bear with as little force against this, as against the doctrine which is attempted to be substituted in its room.

We come now to the objections which are drawn from the immediate language of Scripsure, in those passages in which the nature of our redemption is described. And first, it is asserted, that it is nowhere said in Scripture, that God is reconciled to us by Christ's death, but that we are every where said to be reconciled to God, (No. XX.) Now, in this objection, which clearly lays the whole stress upon our obedience, we discover the secret spring of this entire system, which is set up in opposition to the scheme of atonement; we see that reluctance to part with the proud feeling of merit, with which the principle of Redemption by the sacrifice of Christ is openly at war; and, consequently, we see the essential difference there is between the two doctrines at present under consideration, and the necessity there exists for separating them by the clearest marks of distinction. But, to return to the objection that has been made: it very fortunately happens, that we have the meaning of the words in their Scripture use, defined by no less an authority than that of our Saviour himself:—"If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way — first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift," (Matt. v. 23, 24.) Now, from this plain instance, in which the person offending is expressly described as the party to be reconciled to him who had been offended, by agreeing to his terms of accommodation, and thereby making his peace with him, it manifestly appears in what sense this expression is to be understood, in the language of the New Testament. The very words, then, produced for the purpose of shewing that there was no displeasure on the part of God, which it was necessary by some means to avert, prove the direct contrary: and our being reconciled to God, evidently does not mean, our giving up our sins, and thereby laying aside our enmity to God, (No. XXI.)—in which sense the objection supposes it to be taken—but the turning away his displeasure, whereby we are enabled to regain his favour. And, indeed, it were strange had it not meant this. What! are we to suppose the God of the Christian, like the Deity of the Epicurean, to look on with indifference upon the actions of this life, and not to be offended at the sinner? The displeasure of God, it is to be remembered, is not, like man's displeasure, a resentment or passion, but a judicial disapprobation; which if we abstract from our notion of God, we must cease to view him as the moral governor of the world. And it is from the want of this distinction, which is so highly necessary, and the consequent fear of degrading the Deity, by attributing to him what might appear to be the weakness of passion, that they, who trust to reason more than to Scripture, have been withheld from admitting any principle that implied displeasure on the part of God. Had they attended but a little to the plain language of Scripture, they might have rectified their mistake. They would there have found the wrath of God against the disobedient spoken of in almost every page, (No. XXII.) They would have found also a case, which is exactly in point to the main argument before us; in which there is described, not only the wrath of God, but, the turning away of his displeasure by the mode of sacrifice. The case is that of the three friends of Job, — in which God expressly says that his "wrath is kindled against the friends of Job, because they had not spoken of him the thing that was right," (Job, xlii. 7;) and at the same time directs them to offer up a sacrifice, as the way of averting his anger, (No. XXIII.)

But then it is urged, that God is every where spoken of as a Being of infinite love. True; and the whole difficulty arises from building on partial texts. When men perpetually talk of God's justice as being necessarily modified by his goodness, (No. XXIV,) they seem to forget that it is no less the language of Scripture, and of reason, that his goodness should be modified by his justice. Our error on this subject proceeds from our own narrow views, which compel us to consider the attributes of the Supreme Being as so many distinct qualities; when we should conceive of them as inseparably blended together, and his whole nature as one great impulse to what is best.

As to God's displeasure against sinners, there can be then, upon the whole, no reasonable ground of doubt. And against the doctrine of atonement, no difficulty can arise from the Scripture phrase, of men being reconciled to God; since, as we have seen, that directly implies the turning away the displeasure of God, so as to be again restored to his favour and protection.

But, though all this must be admitted by those who will not shut their eyes against reason and Scripture, yet still it is contended, that the death of Christ cannot be considered as a propitiatory sacrifice. Now, when we find him described as "the Lamb (No. XXV.) of God, which taketh away the sins of the world," (John, i. 29;) when we are told, that "Christ hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God," (Ephes. v. 2;) and that he "needed not, like the High Priests under the law, to offer up sacrifice daily, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for that this he did once, when he offered up himself," (Hebrews, vii. 27;) when he is expressly asserted to be the "propitiation for our sins," (1 John, ii. 2;) and God is said to have "loved us, and to have sent his Son to be the propitiation (No. XXVI.) for our sins," (1 John, iv. 10;) when Isaiah, (liii. 10) describes "his soul as made an offering for sin," (No. XXVII.); when it is said that "God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all," (Rom. viii. 32;) and that "by him we have received the (No. XXVIII.) atonement," (Rom. v. 11;) when these and many other such passages, are to be found; when every expression, referring to the death of Christ, evidently indicates the notion of a sacrifice of atonement and propitiation; when this sacrifice is particularly represented as of the nature of a sin offering, which was a species of (No. XXIX.) sacrifice "prescribed to be offered upon the commission of an offence, after which the offending person was considered as if he had never sinned:" — it may well appear surprising on what ground it can be questioned that the death of Christ is pronounced in Scripture to have been a sacrifice of atonement and expiation for the sins of men.

It is asserted that the several passages which seem to speak this language contain nothing more than figurative allusions; that all that is intended is, that Christ laid down his life for, that is, on account of, mankind, (No. XXX.); and that there being circumstances of resemblance between this event and the sacrifices of the law, terms were borrowed from the latter, to express the former in a manner more lively and impressive. And as a proof that the application of these terms is but figurative, (No. XXXI.) it is contended, (No. XXXII.) 1st, That the death of Christ did not correspond literally, and exactly, to the ceremonies of the Mosaic sacrifice: 2dly, That being, in different places, compared to different kinds of sacrifices, to all of which it could not possibly correspond, it cannot be considered as exactly of the nature of any: and lastly, That there was no such thing as a sacrifice of propitiation or expiation of sin, under the Mosaic dispensation at all, this notion having been entirely of heathen origin, (No. XXXIII.)

As to the two first arguments, they deserve but little consideration. The want of an exact similitude to the precise form of the Mosaic sacrifice is but a slender objection. It might as well be said, that because Christ was not of the species of animal which had usually been offered up; or because he was not slain in the same manner; or because he was not offered by the High Priest, there could have been no sacrifice, (No. XXXIV.) But this is manifest trifling. If the formal notion of a sacrifice for sin, that is, a life offered up in expiation, be adhered to, nothing more can be required to constitute it a sacrifice, except by those who mean to cavil, not to discover truth.

Again, as to the second argument, which, from the comparison of Christ's death to the different kinds of sacrifices, would infer that it was not of the nature of any, it may be replied, that it will more reasonably follow that it was of the nature of all. Resembling that of the Passover, (No. XXXV.) inasmuch as by it we were delivered from an evil yet greater than that of Egyptian bondage; partaking the nature of the Sin offering, as being accepted in expiation of transgression; and similar to the institution of the Scape-goat, as bearing the accumulated sins of all; may we not reasonably suppose that this one great sacrifice contained the full import and completion of the whole sacrificial system; and that so far from being spoken of in figure, as bearing some resemblance to the sacrifices of the Law, they were, on the contrary, as the apostle expressly tells us, (Hebrews, x. 1,) but figures, or faint and partial representations, of this stupendous sacrifice, which had been ordained from the beginning? And, besides, it is to be remarked in general, with respect to the figurative application of the sacrificial terms to the death of Christ, that the striking resemblance between that and the sacrifices of the law, which is assigned as the reason of such application, would have produced just the contrary effect upon the sacred writers; since they must have been aware that the constant use of such expressions, aided by the strength of the resemblance, must have laid a foundation for error in that which constitutes the main doctrine of the Christian faith. Being addressed to a people whose religion was entirely sacrificial, in what, but the obvious and literal sense, could the sacrificial representations of the death of Christ have been understood?

We come now to the third and principal objection, which is built upon the assertion, that no sacrifices of atonement (in the sense in which we apply this term to the death of Christ) had existence under the Mosaic Law; such as were called by that name having had an entirely different import, (No. XXXVI.) Now, that certain offerings under this denomination related to things, and were employed for the purpose of purification, so as to render them fit instruments of the ceremonial worship, must undoubtedly be admitted. That others were again appointed to relieve persons from ceremonial incapacities, so as to restore them to the privilege of joining in the services of the temple, is equally true. But that there were others of a nature strictly propitiatory, and ordained to avert the displeasure of God from the transgressor not only of the ceremonial, but, in some cases, even of the moral law, (No. XXXVII.) will appear manifest upon a very slight examination. Thus, we find it decreed, that "if a soul sin, and commit a trespass against the Lord, and lie unto his neighbour in that which was delivered him to keep — or have found that which was lost, and lieth concerning it, and sweareth falsely, then, because he hath sinned in this, he shall not only make restitution to his neighbour — but he shall bring his trespass-offering unto the Lord, a ram without blemish out of the flock; and the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord, and it shall be forgiven him," (Levit. vi. 2—7.) And again, in a case of criminal connection with a bond-maid who was betrothed, the offender is ordered to "bring his trespass-offering, and the priest is to make atonement for him with the trespass-offering, for the sin which he hath done; and the sin which he hath done shall be forgiven him," (Levit. xix. 20 — 22.) And in the case of all offences which fell not under the description of presumptuous, it is manifest, from the slightest inspection of the book of Leviticus, that the atonement prescribed was appointed as the means whereby God might be propitiated, or reconciled to the offender.

Again, as to the vicarious (No. XXXVIII.) import of the Mosaic sacrifice, or, in other words, its expressing an acknowledgment of what the sinner had deserved; this not only seems directly set forth in the account of the first offering in Leviticus, where it is said of the person who brought a free-will offering, "he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering, (No. XXXIX.) and it shall be accepted for him, to make atonement for him," (Levit. i. 4;) but the ceremony of the scape-goat on the day of expiation appears to place this matter beyond doubt. On this head, however, as not being necessary to my argument, (No. XL.) I shall not at present enlarge.

That expiatory sacrifice (in the strict and proper sense of the word) was a part of the Mosaic institution, there remains then, I trust, no sufficient reason to deny. That it existed in like manner amongst the Arabians, (No. LIX.) in the time of Job, we have already seen. And that its universal prevalence in the Heathen world, though corrupted and disfigured by idolatrous practices, was the result of an original divine appointment, every candid inquirer will find little reason to doubt, (No. XLI.) But, be this as it may, it must be admitted, that propitiatory sacrifices not only existed throughout the whole Gentile world, but had place under the law of Moses. The argument, then, which, from the non-existence of such sacrifices amongst the Jews, would deny the term when applied to the death of Christ to indicate such sacrifice, necessarily falls to the ground, (No. XLII.)

But, in fact, they who deny the sacrifice of Christ to be a real and proper sacrifice for sin, must, if they are consistent, deny that any such sacrifice ever did exist, by divine appointment.

For on what principle do they deny the former, but this? — that the sufferings and death of Christ, for the sins and salvation of men, can make no change in God; cannot render him more ready to forgive, more benevolent, than he is in his own nature; and, consequently, can have no power to avert from the offender the punishment of his transgression. Now, on the same principle, every sacrifice for the expiation of sin must be impossible. And this explains the true cause why these persons will not admit the language of the New Testament, clear and express as it is, to signify a real and proper sacrifice for sin; and why they feel it necessary to explain away the equally clear and express description of that species of sacrifice in the Old, (No. XLIII.) Setting out with a preconceived, erroneous notion of its nature, and one which involves a manifest contradiction, they hold themselves justified in rejecting every acceptation of Scripture which supports it. But, had they more accurately examined the true import of the term in Scripture use, they would have perceived no such contradiction, nor would they have found themselves compelled to refine away, by strained and unnatural interpretations, the clear and obvious meaning of the sacred text. They would have seen that a sacrifice for sin, in Scripture language, implies solely this, — "a sacrifice wisely and graciously appointed by God, the moral governor of the world, to expiate the guilt of sin in such a manner as to avert the punishment of it from the offender," (No. XLIV.) To ask why God should have appointed this particular mode, or in what way it can avert the punishment of sin; is to take us back to the general point at issue with the Deist, which has been already discussed. With the Christian, who admits redemption under any modification, such matters cannot be subject of inquiry.

But, even to our imperfect apprehension, some circumstances of natural connection and fitness may be pointed out. The whole may be considered as a sensible and striking representation of a punishment, which the sinner was conscious he deserved from God's justice: and then, on the part of God, it becomes a public declaration of his holy displeasure against sin, and of his merciful compassion for the sinner; and on the part of the offender, when offered by or for him, it implies a sincere confession of guilt, and a hearty desire of obtaining pardon: and upon the due performance of this service, the sinner is pardoned, and escapes the penalty of his trangression.

This we shall find agreeable to the nature of a sacrifice for sin, as laid down in the Old Testament. Now, is there any thing in this degrading to the honour of God, or in the smallest degree inconsistent with the dictates of natural reason? And, in this view, what is there in the death of Christ, as a sacrifice for the sins of mankind, that may not, in a certain degree, be embraced by our natural notions? For, according to the explanation just given, is it not a declaration to the whole world, of the greatness of their sins; and of the proportionate mercy and compassion of God, who had ordained this method, whereby, in a manner consistent with his attributes, his fallen creatures might be again taken into his favour, on their making themselves parties in this great sacrifice; that is, on their complying with those conditions, which, on the received notion of sacrifice, would render them parties in this; namely, an adequate conviction of guilt, a proportionate sense of God's love, and a firm determination, with an humble faith in the sufficiency of this sacrifice, to endeavour after a life of amendment and obedience? Thus much falls within the reach of our comprehension on this mysterious subject. Whether, in the expanded range of God's moral government, some other end may not be held in view, in the death of his only begotten Son, it is not for us to inquire; nor does it in any degree concern us. What God has been pleased to reveal, it is alone our duty to believe.

One remarkable circumstance, indeed, there is, in which the sacrifice of Christ differs from all those sacrifices which were offered under the law. Our blessed Lord was not only the subject of the offering, but the priest who offered it. Therefore he has become not only a sacrifice, but an intercessor; his intercession being founded upon this voluntary act of benevolence, by which "he offered himself without spot to God." We are not only, then, in virtue of the sacrifice, forgiven; but, in virtue of the intercession, admitted to favour and grace. And thus the Scripture notion of the sacrifice of Christ includes every advantage, which the advocates for the pure intercession seek from their scheme of redemption. But it also contains others, which they necessarily lose by the rejection of that notion. It contains the great advantage (No. XLV.) of impressing mankind with a due sense of their guilt, by compelling a comparison with the immensity of the sacrifice made to redeem them from its effects. It contains that, in short, which is the soul and substance of all Christian virtue — HUMILITY. And the fact is plainly this, that, in every attempt to get rid of the Scripture doctrine of atonement, we find feelings of a description opposite to this evangelic quality, more or less, to prevail: we find a fondness for the opinion of man's own sufficiency, and an unwillingness to submit, with devout and implicit reverence, to the sacred word of Revelation.

If, now, upon the whole, it has appeared, that natural reason is unable to evince the efficacy of repentance; if it has appeared, that, for the purpose of forgiveness, the idea of a mediatorial scheme is perfectly consistent with our ordinary notions; if it has appeared, that Revelation has most unequivocally pronounced, that, through the mediation of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our redemption has been effected; if it has appeared, that Christ is declared to have effected that redemption by the sacrifice of himself for the sins of mankind; if it has appeared, that in the Scripture meaning of sacrifice for sin, is included atonement for transgression; and if it has appeared, that the expression has been applied to Christ, in the plain and literal sense of the word, as the propitiation of an offended God,—I trust we are sufficiently fortified against the Deist, who denies the divine mission; against the Socinian, who denies the redeeming mediation; and against the modern rationalising Arian, who denies the expiatory sacrifice of Christ: in short, against all, who would deprive us of any part of the precious benefits, which, as on this day, our Saviour died to procure for us; against all, who would rob us of that humble feeling of our own insufficiency, which alone can give us an ardent and animating faith in the death and merits of our blessed Redeemer.

DISCOURSE II.

"And without shedding of blood is no remission."—HEB. ix. 22.

ON the last commemoration of the awful subject of this day's observance, it was attempted, in this place, to clear the important doctrine of redemption from those difficulties in which it had been artfully entangled by the subtle speculations of the disputatious Deist, and of the philosophising Christian. The impotence of reason to erect the degraded sinner to an assured hope of the sufficiency of repentance, pointed out to us the necessity of an express revelation on this head: that revelation, in announcing the expedient of a Mediator, was seen to fall in with the analogies of the providential economy; the Mediatorial scheme was shewn to have been accomplished, through the sacrifice of the only begotten Son of God; and this sacrifice to have been effective to the expiation of the sins of the whole human race. What the peculiar nature and true import of this sacrifice are, and in what sense the expiation effected by it is strictly to be understood, it is my purpose on this day to inquire. And as, on the one hand, there is no article of Christian knowledge of deeper concern, and, on the other, none that has been more studiously involved in obscurity, I trust that you, my young brethren, will not refuse your patient attention, whilst I endeavour to unfold to your apprehension the genuine, because the scriptural, interpretation of that great sacrifice, whereby we are redeemed from the power of sin, and have received the promise of an eternal inheritance.

In the mode of inquiry which has been usually adopted on this subject, one prevailing error deserves to be noticed. The nature of sacrifice, as generally practised and understood, antecedent to the time of Christ, has been first examined; and from that, as a ground of explanation, the notion of Christ's sacrifice has been derived; whereas, in fact, by this all former sacrifices are to be interpreted; and in reference to it only, can they be understood. From an error so fundamental, it is not wonderful that the greatest perplexities should have arisen concerning the nature of sacrifice in general, and that they should ultimately fall, with cumulative confusion, on the nature of that particular sacrifice, to the investigation of which fanciful and mistaken theories had been assumed as guides. Thus, while some have presumptuously attributed the early and universal practice of sacrifice to an irrational and superstitious fear of an imagined sanguinary divinity, and have been led, in defiance of the express language of revelation, to reject and ridicule the notion of sacrifice, as originating only in the grossness of superstition, (No. XLVI.); others, not equally destitute of reverence for the sacred word, and consequently not treating this solemn rite with equal disrespect, have yet ascribed its origin to human invention, (No. XLVII.); and have thereby been compelled to account for the divine institution of the Jewish sacrifices, as a mere accommodation to prevailing practice; and, consequently, to admit even the sacrifice of Christ itself to have grown out of, and been adapted to, this creature of human excogitation.

Of this latter class, the theories, as might be expected, are various. In one, sacrifices are represented in the light of gifts, (No. XLVIII.) intended to sooth and appease the Supreme Being, in like manner as they are found to conciliate the favour of men; in another, they are considered as federal rites, (No. XLIX.) a kind of eating and drinking with God, as it were, at his table, and thereby implying the being restored to a state of friendship with him, by repentance and confession of sins; in a third they are described as but symbolical actions, or a more expressive language, denoting the gratitude of the offerer, in such as are eucharistical; and in those that are expiatory, the acknowledgment of, and contrition for sin, strongly expressed by the death of the animal, representing that death, which the offerer confessed to be his own desert, (No. L.)

To these different hypotheses, which, in the order of their enumeration, claim respectively the names of Spencer, Sykes, and Warburton, it may generally be replied, that the fact of Abel's sacrifice seems inconsistent with them all: with the first, inasmuch as it must have been antecedent to those distinctions of property, on which alone experience of the effects

(No. LI.) of gifts upon men could have been founded; with the second, inasmuch as it took place several ages prior to that period, at which both the words of Scripture and the opinions of the wisest commentators, have fixed the permission (No. LII.) of animal food to man; with the third, inasmuch as the language, which Scripture expressly states to have been derived to our first parents from divine (No. LIII.) instruction, cannot be supposed so defective in those terms that related to the worship of God, as to have rendered it necessary for Abel to call in the aid of actions, to express the sentiment of gratitude or sorrow; and still less likely is it, that he would have resorted to that species of action, which, in the eye of reason, must have appeared displeasing to God, — the slaughter of an unoffending animal, (No. LIV.)

To urge these topics of objection in their full force against the several theories I have mentioned, would lead to a discussion far exceeding the due limits of a discourse from this place. I therefore dismiss them for the present. Nor shall I, in refutation of the general idea of the human invention of sacrifice, enlarge upon the universality (No. LV.) of the practice; the sameness (No. LVI.) of the notion of its efficacy, pervading nations and ages the most remote; and the unreasonableness of supposing any natural connection between the slaying of an animal and the receiving pardon for the violation of God's laws; — all of which appear decisive against that idea. But, as both the general idea, and the particular theories which have endeavoured to reconcile to it the nature and origin of sacrifice, have been caused by a departure from the true and only source of knowledge, let us return to that sacred fountain; and, whilst we endeavour to establish the genuine Scripture notion of sacrifice, at the same time provide the best refutation of every other.

It requires but little acquaintance with Scripture to know, that the lesson which it every where inculcates, is, that man by disobedience had fallen under the displeasure of his Maker; that to be reconciled to his favour, and restored to the means of acceptable obedience, a Redeemer was appointed; and that this Redeemer laid down his life, to procure for repentant sinners forgiveness and acceptance. This surrender of life has been called by the sacred writers, a sacrifice; and the end attained by it, expiation or atonement. With such as have been desirous to reduce Christianity to a mere moral system it has been a favourite object to represent this sacrifice as entirely figurative, (Nos. XXXI. and XLIII.) founded only in allusion and similitude to the sacrifices of the law; whereas, that this is spoken of by the sacred writers as a real and proper sacrifice, to which those under the law bore respect but as types or shadows, is evident from various passages of Holy Writ, but more particularly from the epistle to the Hebrews; in which it is expressly said, that "the law, having a shadow of good things to come, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect: — but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God," (Heb. x. 1, 12.) And again, when the writer of this epistle speaks of the high priest entering into the holy of holies with the blood of the sacrifice. he asserts, that "this was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect; but Christ being come, an High Priest of good things to come; not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us; for," he adds, "if the blood of bulls and of goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (Heb. ix. 9—14.) It must be unnecessary to detail more of the numerous passages, which go to prove that the sacrifice of Christ was a true and effective sacrifice, whilst those of the Law were but faint representations, and inadequate copies, intended for its introduction.

Now, if the sacrifices of the Law appear to have been but preparations for this one great Sacrifice, we are naturally led to consider, whether the same may not be asserted of sacrifice from the beginning; and whether we are not warranted by Scripture in pronouncing the entire rite to have been ordained by God, as a type of that one sacrifice, in which all others were to have their consummation.

That the institution was of divine (No. LVII.) ordinance may, in the first instance, be reasonably inferred from the strong and sensible attestation of the divine acceptance of sacrifice in the case of Abel, (No. LVIII;) again, in that of Noah; afterwards, in that of Abraham; and also from the systematic establishment of it, by the same divine authority, in the dispensation of Moses. And, whether we consider the book of Job as the production of Moses (No. LIX.); or of that pious worshipper of the true God, among the descendants of Abraham, whose name it bears; or of some other person who lived a short time after, and composed it from the materials left by Job himself; the representation there made of God as prescribing sacrifice to the friends of Job, in every supposition exhibits a strong authority, and of high antiquity, upon this question.

These few facts, which I have stated, unaided by any comment, and abstracting altogether from the arguments which embarrass the contrary hypothesis, to which I have already alluded, might, perhaps, be sufficient to satisfy an inquiring and candid mind, that sacrifice must have had its origin in divine institution. But if, in addition, this rite, as practised in the earliest ages, shall be found connected with the sacrifice of Christ, confessedly of divine appointment, little doubt can reasonably remain on this head. Let us then examine, more particularly, the circumstances of the first sacrifice offered up by Abel.

It is clear from the words of Scripture, that both Cain and Abel made oblations to the Lord. It is clear also, notwithstanding the well known fanciful interpretation of an eminent commentator, (No. LX.) that Abel's was an animal sacrifice. It is no less clear that Abel's was accepted, whilst that of Cain was rejected. Now, what could have occasioned the distinction?—The acknowledgment of the Supreme Being, and of his universal dominion, was no less strong in the offering of the fruits of the earth by Cain, than in that of the firstlings of the flock by Abel; the intrinsic efficacy of the gift must have been the same in each, each giving of the best that he possessed: the expression of gratitude equally significant and forcible in both. How then is the difference (No. LXI.) to be explained? If we look to the writer to the Hebrews, he informs us, that the ground on which Abel's oblation was preferred to that of Cain, was, that Abel offered his in faith; and the criterion of this faith also appears to have been, in the opinion of this writer, the animal sacrifice. The words are remarkable—"By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts," (Heb. xi. 4). The words here translated, "a more excellent sacrifice," are in an early version rendered "a much more sacrifice," (No. LXII.) which phrase, though uncouth in form, adequately conveys the original. The meaning then is, that by faith Abel offered that, which was much more of the true nature of sacrifice than what had been offered by Cain. Abel, consequently, was directed by faith; and this faith was manifested in the nature of his offering. What, then, are we to infer?—Without some revelation granted, (No. LXIII.) some assurance held out as the object of faith, Abel could not have exercised this virtue; and without some peculiar mode of sacrifice enjoined, he could not have exemplified his faith by an appropriate offering. The offering made, we have already seen, was that of an animal. Let us consider, whether this could have a connection with any divine assurance, communicated at that early day.

It is obvious that the promise made to our first parents conveyed an intimation of some future deliverer, who should overcome the tempter that had drawn man from his innocence, and remove those evils which had been occasioned by the Fall. This assurance, without which, or some other ground of hope, it seems difficult to conceive how the principle of religion could have had place among men, became to our first parents the grand object of faith. To perpetuate this fundamental article of religious belief among the descendants of Adam, some striking memorial of the fall of man, and of the promised deliverance, would naturally be appointed, (No. LXIV.) And if we admit, that the scheme of redemption by the death of the only begotten Son of God, was determined from the beginning; that is, if we admit that when God had ordained the deliverance of man, he had ordained the means; if we admit, that Christ was "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world;" what memorial could be devised more apposite than that of animal sacrifice?—exemplifying, by the slaying of the victim, the death which had been denounced against man's disobedience: thus exhibiting the awful lesson of that death which was the wages of sin, and at the same time representing that death which was actually to be undergone by the Redeemer of mankind:—and hereby connecting in one view the two great cardinal events in the history of man,—the fall and the recovery; the death denounced against sin; and the death appointed for that Holy One, who was to lay down his life to deliver man from the consequences of sin. The institution of animal sacrifice seems, then, to have been peculiarly significant, as containing all the elements of religious knowledge; and the adoption of this rite, with sincere and pious feelings, would at the same time imply an humble sense of the unworthiness of the offerer: a confession that death, which was inflicted on the victim, was the desert of those sins which had arisen from man's transgression; and a full reliance upon the promises of deliverance, joined to an acquiescence in the means appointed for its accomplishment.

If this view of the matter be just, there is nothing improbable even in the supposition, that that part of the signification of the rite, which related to the sacrifice of Christ, might have been in some degree made known from the beginning. But, not to contend for this, (Scripture having furnished no express foundation for the assumption,) room for the exercise of faith is equally preserved, on the idea, that animal sacrifice was enjoined in the general as the religious sign of faith in the promise of redemption, without any intimation of the way in which it became a sign. Agreeably to these principles, we shall find but little difficulty in determining on what ground it was that Abel's offering was accepted, whilst that of Cain was rejected. Abel, in firm reliance on the promise of God, and in obedience to his command, offered that sacrifice, which had been enjoined as the religious expression of his faith: whilst Cain, disregarding the gracious assurances that had been vouchsafed, or, at least, disdaining to adopt the prescribed mode of manifesting his belief, possibly as not appearing to his reason to possess any efficacy or natural fitness, thought he had sufficiently acquitted himself of his duty, in acknowledging the general superintendence of God, and expressing his gratitude to the Supreme Benefactor, by presenting some of those good things which he thereby confessed to have been derived from his bounty. In short, Cain, the first-born of the fall, exhibits the first-fruits of his parent's disobedience, in the arrogance and self-sufficiency of reason rejecting the aids of revelation, because they fell not within his apprehension of right. He takes the first place in the annals of Deism, and displays, in his proud rejection of the ordinance of sacrifice, the same spirit which, in later days, has actuated his enlightened followers, in rejecting the sacrifice of Christ.

This view of the subject receives strength from the terms of expostulation in which God addresses Cain, on his expressing resentment at the rejection of his offering, and the acceptance of Abel's. The words in the present version are, "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? — and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door," (Gen. iv. 7,)—which words, as they stand connected in the context, supply no very satisfactory meaning, and have long served to exercise the ingenuity of commentators to but little purpose. But if the word, which is here translated "sin," be rendered, as we find it in a great variety of passages in the Old Testament, a "sin-offering," the reading of the passage then becomes, "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, a sin-offering lieth even at the door," (No. LXV.) The connection is thus rendered evident. God rebukes Cain for not conforming to that species of sacrifice, which had been offered by Abel. He refers to it, as a matter of known injunction; and hereby points out the ground of distinction, in his treatment of him and his brother: and thus, in direct terms, enforces the observance of animal sacrifice.

As that part of my general position, which pronounces sacrifice to have been of divine institution, receives support from the passage just recited; so, to that part of it, which maintains that this rite bore an aspect to the sacrifice of Christ, additional evidence may be derived from the language of the writer to the Hebrews, inasmuch as he places the blood of Abel's sacrifice in direct comparison with the blood of Christ, which he styles pre-eminently "the blood of sprinkling," (Heb. xii. 24;) and represents both, as "speaking good things," in different degrees, (No. LXVI.) What then is the result of the foregoing reflections? — The sacrifice of Abel was an animal sacrifice. This sacrifice was accepted. The ground of this acceptance was the faith in which it was offered. Scripture assigns no other object of this faith, but the promise of a Redeemer: and of this faith, the offering of an animal in sacrifice appears to have been the legitimate, and, consequently, the instituted expression. The institution of animal sacrifice, then, was coeval with the Fall, and had a reference to the sacrifice of our redemption. But, as it had also an immediate, and most apposite, application to that important event in the condition of man, which, as being the occasion of, was essentially connected with, the work of redemption; that likewise, we have reason to think, was included in its signification. And thus, upon the whole, sacrifice appears to have been ordained, as a standing memorial of the death introduced by sin, and of that death which was to be suffered by the Redeemer.

We, accordingly, find this institution of animal sacrifice continue until the giving of the Law: no other offering than that of an animal being recorded in Scripture down to this period, (No. LXVII.,) except in the case of Cain; and that, we have seen, was rejected. The sacrifices of Noah and of Abraham are stated to have been burnt-offerings. Of the same kind also were the sin-offerings presented by Job; he being said to have offered burnt-offerings according to the number of his sons, lest some of them "might have sinned in their hearts," (Job, i. 5.) But, when we come to the promulgation of the law, we find the connection between animal sacrifice and atonement, or reconciliation with God, clearly and distinctly announced. It is here declared, that sacrifices for sin should, on conforming to certain prescribed modes of oblation, be accepted as the means of deliverance from the penal consequences of transgression. And, with respect to the peculiar efficacy of animal sacrifice, we find this remarkable declaration — "The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make atonement for the soul," (Lev. xvii. 11:) in reference to which words, the sacred writer, from whom I have taken the subject of this day's discourse, formally pronounces, that "without shedding of blood there is no remission." Now, in what conceivable light can we view this institution, but in relation to that great Sacrifice, which was to make atonement for sins; to that "blood of sprinkling," which was to "speak better things than that of Abel," (Heb. xii. 24,) or that of the law? The law itself is said to have had respect solely unto him. To what else can the principal institution of the law refer? — an institution, too, which, unless so referred, appears utterly unmeaning. The offering up an animal cannot be imagined to have had any intrinsic efficacy in procuring pardon for the transgression of the offerer. The blood of bulls and of goats could have possessed no virtue whereby to cleanse him from his offences. Still less intelligible is the application of the blood of the victim to the purifying of the parts of the tabernacle, and the apparatus of the ceremonial worship. All this can clearly have had no other than an instituted meaning; and can be understood only as in reference to some blood-shedding, which, in an eminent degree, possessed the power of purifying from pollution. In short, admit the sacrifice of Christ to be held in view in the institutions of the Law, and every part is plain and intelligible; reject that notion, and every theory devised by the ingenuity of man, to explain the nature of the ceremonial worship, becomes trifling and inconsistent.

Granting, then, the case of the Mosaic sacrifice and that of Abel to be the same; neither of them in itself efficacious; both instituted by God; and both instituted in reference to that true and efficient Sacrifice, which was one day to be offered; the rite, as practised before the time of Christ, may justly be considered as a sacramental memorial, "shewing forth the Lord's death until he came," (1 Cor. xi. 26;) and when accompanied with a due faith in the promises made to the early believers, may reasonably be judged to have been equally acceptable with that sacramental memorial, which has been enjoined by our Lord himself to his followers, for the "shewing forth his death until his coming again." And it deserves to be noticed, that this very analogy seems to be intimated by our Lord, in the language used by him at the institution of that solemn Christian rite. For, in speaking of his own blood, he calls it, in direct reference to the blood wherewith Moses established and sanctified the first covenant, "the blood of the new covenant, which was shed for the remission of sins," (Matt. xxvi. 28;) thus plainly marking out the similitude in the nature and objects of the two covenants, at the moment that he was prescribing the great sacramental commemoration of his own sacrifice.

From this view of the subject, the history of Scripture sacrifice becomes consistent throughout. The sacrifice of Abel, and the Patriarchal sacrifices down to the giving of the Law, record and exemplify those momentous events in the history of man — the death incurred by sin, and that inflicted on our Redeemer. When length of time, and mistaken notions of religion leading to idolatry and every perversion of the religious principle, had so far clouded and obscured this expressive act of primeval worship, that it had ceased to be considered by the nations of the world in that reference, in which its true value consisted; when the mere rite remained, without any remembrance of the promises, and consequently unaccompanied by that faith in their fulfilment which was to render it an acceptable service; when the nations, deifying every passion of the human heart, and erecting altars to every vice, poured forth the blood of the victim, but to deprecate the wrath, or satiate the vengeance of each offended deity; when, with the recollection of the true God, all knowledge of the true worship was effaced from the minds of men; and when, joined to the absurdity of the sacrificial rites, their cruelty, devoting to the malignity of innumerable sanguinary gods endless multitudes of human victims, demanded the divine interference; then we see a people peculiarly selected, to whom, by express revelation, the knowledge of the one God is restored, and the species of worship, ordained by him from the beginning, particularly enjoined. The principal part of the Jewish service we accordingly find to consist of sacrifice; to which the virtue of expiation and atonement is expressly annexed: and, in the manner of it, the particulars appear so minutely set forth, that, when the object of the whole law should be brought to light, no doubt could remain as to its intended application. The Jewish sacrifices, therefore, seem to have been designed, as those from the beginning had been, to prefigure that one, which was to make atonement for all mankind. And as, in this, all were to receive their consummation, so with this, they all conclude; and the institution closes with the completion of its object. But, as the gross perversions, which had pervaded the Gentile world, had reached likewise to the chosen people; and as the temptations to idolatry, which surrounded them on all sides, were so powerful as perpetually to endanger their adherence to the God of their fathers, we find the ceremonial service adapted to their carnal habits. And, since the Law itself, with its accompanying sanctions, seems to have been principally temporal; so, the worship it enjoins is found to have been, for the most part, rather a public and solemn declaration of allegiance to the true God in opposition to the Gentile idolatries, than a pure and spiritual obedience in moral and religious matters, which was reserved for that more perfect system, appointed to succeed in due time, when the state of mankind would permit.

That the sacrifices of the Law should, therefore, have chiefly operated to the cleansing from external impurities, and to the rendering persons or things fit to approach God in the exercises of the ceremonial worship; whilst, at the same time, they were designed to prefigure the sacrifice of Christ, which was purely spiritual, and possessed the transcendent virtue of atoning for all moral pollution — involves no inconsistency whatever, since in this the true proportion of the entire dispensations is preserved. And to this point it is particularly necessary that our attention should be directed in the examination of the present subject; as upon the apparent disproportion in the objects and effects of sacrifice in the Mosaic and Christain schemes, the principal objections against their intended correspondence have been founded, (No. LXVIII.)

The sacrifices of the Law, then, being preparatory to that of Christ; "the Law itself being but a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ;" the sacred writers in the New Testament naturally adopt the sacrificial terms of the ceremonial service; and, by their reference to the use of them as employed under the Law, clearly point out the sense in which they are to be understood, in their application under the Gospel. In examining, therefore, the meaning of such terms, when they occur in the New Testament, we are clearly directed to the explanation that is circumstantially given of them in the Old. Thus, when we find the virtue of atonement attributed to the sacrifice of Christ, in like manner as it had been to those under the law; by attending to the representation so minutely given of it in the latter, we are enabled to comprehend its true import in the former, (No. LXIX.)

Of the several sacrifices under the Law, that one which seems most exactly to illustrate the sacrifice of Christ, and which is expressly compared with it by the writer to the Hebrews, is that which was offered for the whole assembly on the solemn anniversary of expiation, (No. LXX.) The circumstances of this ceremony, whereby atonement was to be made for the sins of the whole Jewish people, seem so strikingly significant, that they deserve a particular detail. On the day appointed for this general expiation, the priest is commanded to offer a bullock and a goat, as sin-offerings, the one for himself, and the other for the people: and, having sprinkled the blood of these in due form before the mercy-seat, to lead forth a second goat, denominated the scape-goat, and after laying both his hands upon the head of the scape-goat, and confessing over him all the iniquities of the people, to put them upon the head of the goat, and to send the animal, thus bearing the sins of the people, away into the wilderness: in this manner expressing, by an action which cannot be misunderstood, that the atonement, which it is directly affirmed was to be effected by the sacrifice of the sin-offering, consisted in removing from the people their iniquities by a symbolical translation to the animal. For it is to be remarked, that the ceremony of the scape-goat is not a distinct one; it is a continuation of the process, and is evidently the concluding part, and symbolical consummation, of the sin-offering, (No. LXXI.) So that the transfer of the iniquities of the people upon the head of the scape-goat, and the bearing them away to the wilderness, manifestly imply, that the atonement effected by the sacrifice of the sin-offering consisted in the transfer and consequent removal of those iniquities. What, then, are we taught to infer from this ceremony? — That, as the atonement under the Law, or expiation of the legal transgressions, was represented as a translation of those transgressions in the act of sacrifice in which the animal was slain, and the people thereby cleansed from their legal impurities, and released from the penalties which had been incurred; so, the great atonement for the sins of mankind was to be effected by the sacrifice of Christ, undergoing, for the restoration of men to the favour of God, that death, which had been denounced against sin; and which he suffered in like manner as if the sins of men had been actually transferred to him, as those of the congregation had been symbolically transferred to the sin-offering of the people.

That this is the true meaning of the atonement effected by Christ's sacrifice, receives the fullest confirmation from every part of both the Old and the New Testament; and that, thus far, the death of Christ is vicarious, cannot be denied without a total disregard of the sacred writings.

It has, indeed, been asserted, by those who oppose the doctrine of atonement as thus explained, that nothing vicarious appears in the Mosaic sacrifices, (No. LXXII.) With what justice this assertion has been made, may be judged from the instance of the sin-offering that has been adduced. The transfer to the animal of the iniquities of the people, (which must necessarily mean the transfer of their penal effects, or the subjecting the animal to suffer on account of those iniquities,) — this accompanied with the death of the victim; and the consequence of the whole being the removal of the punishment of those iniquities from the offerers, and the ablution of all legal offensiveness in the sight of God,— thus much of the nature of vicarious, the language of the Old Testament justifies us in attaching to the notion of atonement. Less than this we are clearly not at liberty to attach to it. And what the Law thus sets forth as its express meaning directly determines that which we must attribute to the great atonement, of which the Mosaic ceremony was but a type: always remembering carefully to distinguish between the figure and the substance; duly adjusting their relative value and extent; estimating the efficacy of the one, as real, intrinsic, and universal; whilst that of the other is to be viewed as limited, derived, and emblematic, (No. LXXIII.)

It must be confessed, that, to the principles on which the doctrine of the Christian atonement has been explained in this, and a former discourse, several objections, in addition to those already noticed, have been advanced, (No. LXXIV.) These, however, cannot now be examined in this place. The most important have been discussed ; and as for such as remain, I trust that, to a candid mind, the general view of the subject which has been given will prove sufficient for their refutation.

One word more, my young brethren, and I have done. On this day we have assembled to commemorate the stupendous sacrifice of himself, offered up by our blessed Lord for our redemption from the bondage and wages of sin : and, on next Sunday, we are invited to participate of that solemn rite, which he hath ordained for the purpose of making us partakers in the benefit of that sacrifice. Allow me to remind you, that this is an awful call, and upon an awful occasion. Let him who either refuses to obey this call, or presumes to attend upon it irreverently, beware what his condition is. The man who can be guilty of either deliberately is not safe.

Consider seriously what has been said, and "may the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

ILLUSTRATIONS AND EXPLANATORY DISSERTATIONS.

No. I.—Page 7. Col. 1.

ON THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF CHRIST, AND THE SPECIES OF ARGUMENTS BY WHICH THIS ARTICLE OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE HAS BEEN OPPOSED.

'Εκένωσεν ἑαυτόν — strictly, "emptied himself"—viz. of that "form of God—that Glory which he had with God before the world was"— see Phil. ii. 6, 7, compared with John xvii. 5.— see also Krebs. *Observ. Flav.* p. 329. *Fortuita Sacra,* p. 217 — 219. Elsner. *Obs. Sac.* ii. p. 240 — 245. See also Schleusner, on the word ἐκένωσεν. On the whole of the passage from Philippians, I would particularly recommend the observations of Bishop Tomline, *Elements,* &c. vol. ii. p. 111 — 115. Middleton likewise (*Doctrine of the Greek Article,* p. 537 — 539) deserves to be consulted.

It has, indeed, been pronounced, in a late extraordinary publication, distinguished at least as much by strength of assertion as by force of argument, that "a person who has not paid particular attention to the subject would be surprised to find how very few texts there are, which even *seem* directly to assert the pre-existence of Christ."—How this matter may appear to those who have "not paid particular attention to the subject," I leave to the author of this work to determine. With those who have, it is unnecessary to say what must be the reception of an observation so directly opposed, not more to the plain and uniform language of Scripture, than to every conclusion of a just and rational criticism applied to the sacred text. Bold, however, as this writer appears in assertion, he seems by no means deficient in prudence ; for, whilst he affirms that even those few texts (as he chooses to represent them) furnish no real support to the doctrine they are adduced to confirm, he has on this position, as on almost every other throughout his book, affecting the interpretation of Scripture, declined exposing his proof to hazard. We are referred, indeed, to "the *Commentary* of Grotius, Dr Lardner's *Letter on the Logos,* Mr Lindsey's *Apology for resigning the Vicarage of Catterick,* and the *Sequel* to that Apology, Hopton Haynes *on the Attributes of God,* and Dr Priestley's *History of Early Opinions.*" These, we are told, will completely overturn the unscriptural notion of the pre-existence of Christ. And this they are to accomplish, by shewing, that all such passages as contribute to its support, "are either interpolated, corrupted, or misunderstood." (See Mr Thomas Belsham's *Review of Mr Wilberforce's Treatise,* pp. 272, 273.) Intrenched behind this oddly marshalled phalanx, this gentleman feels perfectly secure. It seems indeed somewhat strange, that, encouraged by such powerful aid, he has not thought fit to offer a single text in support of his own opinion, nor a confutation of any one of those which have been urged by his adversaries in defence of theirs.

In the face, however, of this polemic array, and in defiance of those extraordinary powers of modifying Scripture which we find here ascribed to it, I have not hesitated to cite the passages referred to in the beginning of this Number. And when we find the great Person who is there spoken of, described, repeatedly, as having *come down from heaven,* as from a place of settled abode previous to his appearance among men, (see John iii. 13. 31 ; vi. 38. 62 ; xiii. 3 ; xvi. 28, &c. ;) when we find him declared by Saint Paul (1 Cor. xv. 47) to be the "Lord from heaven ;" and, again, (Phil. ii. 6—8,) to have been "in the form of God," yet to have taken "upon him the form of a servant," and to have been "made in the likeness of man;" when, again, we find him represented (Heb. i. 2, 3,) as that Being, "by whom God made the worlds;" and as "the brightness of his glory;" which glory, as has been already noticed, he had with God "before the world was;" and when, again, we are told, (Colos. i. 15, 16,) that he "is the image of the invisible God;" and that "by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth;"—when these passages, and many others of the same import, are to be met in the Evangelic and Apostolic writings, and the whole tenor of Scripture is found perfectly corresponding, I own I cannot feel this essential article of the Christian faith much endangered, either from the confidence of this writer's assertions, or from the force of those arguments, under whose mighty shade he is content triumphantly to repose.

Lest, however, curiosity may have been excited with respect to those ἀναπόδεικτοι συλλογισμοί, which Mr B. and his friends profess to have at their command, I subjoin the following specimen.—The passage in Heb. i. 2, which directly assigns the work of creation to Christ, will be admitted to be one of those that "*seem* to assert his pre-existence." In what manner is this fallacious semblance to be removed? Δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν, Grotius translates, "*for* whom he made the worlds;" and thus gives to the word διὰ a signification which not only has no parallel in the entire of the New Testament, but is in direct opposition to the established rule of all grammarians; διὰ, with a genitive case, commonly signifying, the means by which; but never implying the final cause, unless when joined with the accusative. See Phavorinus,[1] Scapula, Stephanus, Hoogeveen *in Viger*. Glassius, &c. See also, on the application of the word in the New Testament, Sykes *on Redemption*, pp. 196, 221, 241,—but particularly Schleusner's enumeration of its various senses,[2] which seems to be quite decisive on the point. The solitary instance which Grotius has been able to discover in defence of his translation of the word διὰ, is to be found in Rom. vi. 4; in which it is manifest that his criticism cannot be maintained. Schleusner so pronounces upon it in the most peremptory terms.

Whilst Grotius thus violates the rules and analogy of the language, in one part of the sentence, later Socinians,[3] finding this mode of distorting the sense indefensible, have betaken themselves to another, where they have exercised an equal violence on the original. Τοὺς αἰῶνας,—which elsewhere in this very epistle (xi. 3) is allowed to mean the material world, and which is always used plurally by the Jews, as implying the inferior and superior worlds, and, in its connection here, exactly corresponds with the things in heaven, and the things in earth (Col. i. 16.); and, upon the whole, clearly means the physical world, or the heavens and the earth,[4]—is yet strained by the Socinians to imply the evangelical dispensation: so that the entire passage is made to signify merely, that, by Christ's ministry, there should be, as it were, a new creation; that is, a new Church begun upon earth. Now, it deserves to be considered, on what principle of just interpretation such a translation can be adopted. It is true, that Christ, in some of the Greek versions of Isai. ix. 6, has been styled, πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. But, admitting the word here to imply a dispensation that was to come, does it follow that this one dispensation is to be expressed by the plural word αἰῶνας? To force upon it this meaning, is again to do violence to grammar and usage. And yet this is done, because the plural interpretation, "by whom he constituted the ages or dispensations," lets in the obnoxious idea of pre-existence, as completely as the sense of a material creation can do.

It may be worth while to inquire, in what way Mr Lindsey has treated this subject, in an essay written by him, in the second volume of the *Theological Repository*, entitled "*Brief Remarks concerning the Two Creations;*" the express object of which is to shew, that none but a moral or spiritual creation was to be ascribed to Christ. He never once notices this passage of Hebrews; but directs his attention, almost entirely, to the text in Colossians, and to that in Ephes. iii. 9. And this is the more remarkable, because he refers to a passage to the same purport, in the very same chapter of Hebrews. The reason of this, however, it may iot be difficult to discover, when it is consilered, that, in the passages which he has exanined, though manifestly repugnant to his onclusion, there was not to be found so brief nd stubborn an expression, as τοὺς αἰῶνας ποίησεν. As to the arguments derived by him rom the passages which he has thought proer to notice, they do not seem entitled to ery minute attention. They amount merely o a note of Mr Locke on the one, and an ssertion, on the other, that the natural creaion cannot have been intended, "because this s uniformly spoken of, throughout the Bible, s effected by the immediate power of God, rithout the interposition of any other being vhatever."

---

[1] Διὰ, πρόθεσις. ὅτε μὲν συντάσσεται γενικῇ, δηλοῖ μεσιτείαν. οἷον, διὰ σοῦ ἐποίησα τόδε, μεσιτεύοντός σου δηλονότι. ὅτε δὲ αἰτιατικῇ, αἰτίαν. οἷον, διὰ σὲ ἐποίησα τόδε. Phavor. p. 480.

[2] Amongst the multiplied texts which Schleusner has collected, the only one which seems to him not to coincide in the general result, is from 2 Pet. i. 3. But this is manifestly a mistake, as may be clearly seen on consulting Rosenmüller, Newcome, and, indeed, almost every commentator upon the passage. It is to be noted, also, that, under the head of διὰ, coupled with the genitive, the 20th sense ascribed by Schleusner bears no reference to the *final cause*, though the Latin term which he makes use of, may at first sight seem to imply it.

[3] I do not mean by this expression to intimate, that Grotius is, strictly speaking, to be ranked among the followers of Socinus. I am aware, that this charge advanced against him by the author of *L'Esprit de M. Arnauld* has been refuted, (see Bayle's *Dict.* vol. v. pp. 581, 582); and his single treatise, *De Satisfactione Christi contra Faustum Socinum*, might be judged sufficient to redeem him from the appellation. But his exposition of most of the passages of Scripture relating to the divinity of Christ is so clearly favourable to the main principle of the Socinian scheme, that, with some latitude, the term *Socinian* is not unfairly applicable. Dr Lardner, in his *Letter on the Logos*, (vol. xi. p. 112—Kippis's edition of his Works,) written expressly for the purpose of establishing the proper humanity of Christ, affirms, that "Grotius explains texts better than the professed Socinians."—Whether Lardner, then, viewed him as far removed from the pale of the Fratres Poloni, is surely not difficult to decide.

[4] See Whitby and Rosenmüller, in loc. and Col. i. 16.; likewise Peirce and Hallet:—also, Krebs. *Observ.* on Col. i. 17.

Thus, Mr Belsham's assertion, that Mr indsey would overturn the notion of the re-existence of Christ, is maintained by Mr indsey's own assertion, that he has done so. Ie admits, indeed, that his argument is not kely to "have any effect upon those who are 'ritheists, or Orthodox in the vulgar and strict ense; who can, with the same breath, and n the same sentence, without being astonished t themselves, assert, that there are three reators and yet but one Creator. There is o arguing," he adds, "with men that can wallow, without feeling, downright contraictions." Mr Belsham, in his engagement at the champions of his tenets would be able lly to establish them, by proving that all ch passages of Scripture as contradicted em were "either interpolated, corrupted, or isunderstood," forgot to make the exception, hich is here very properly introduced by Mr indsey:—for sound argument must surely be st upon such men as the above.

But let us examine, farther, in what way ie parallel passages in Col. i. 16, and Ephes. i. 9, which, by attributing the work of creaon to Christ, seem to intimate his pre-exisnce, are explained by other writers, who are llow-labourers with Mr Belsham in the udable work of reducing the exalted dignity our blessed Saviour to the common stanrd of human nature. "It is true," says Mr yrwhitt, (*Commentaries and Essays*, vol. ii.) that it is said, (Eph. iii. 9,) that God 'cread all things by Jesus Christ.' But these ords are thus to be interpreted:—*things* ust be taken for *persons;* because there are ıssages where the word is so understood:— 'things that are,' must be intended persons eculiarly chosen by God, as the Jews were, opposition to the Gentiles, who are described 'things that are not.' But, as we now speak the Christian dispensation, 'by all things' ust be understood, 'all persons, whether Jews Gentiles, who believe in the Gospel;' and the word *created* is meant to be conveyed, ot the giving being, or bringing into exisnce, but the conferring benefits and priviges, or the placing in a new and more advantageous state of being." And thus, these few *slight* and *obvious* transitions being admitted, Mr Tyrwhitt easily explains the creation of all things by Jesus Christ, to be, the bestowing upon all persons who would accept them, the privileges of the Gospel, by the ministry of Christ.

Again, on Col. i. 16, we are informed by the German divines, Ernestus and Teller, in a similar felicity of interpretation, that, when it is said, "by Christ were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible," &c. it is meant to express, by an easy figure, a new moral creation wrought in the world by the Gospel of Christ: "the things that are in heaven, and that are in earth," meaning the Jews and Pagans,—and the things "visible and invisible," the present and future generations of men! See Rosenmüller's *Scholia*, on Col. i. 16.[5]

To remind these writers that Saint John has placed this matter beyond dispute, in his first chapter, by declaring, that the world which was made by Christ, was a world which "yet knew him not," and therefore could not have been the work of a spiritual creation, the very nature of which was to bestow the true knowledge of Christ and his Gospel; to remind them, I say, of this, and of the other express declarations in that chapter on the subject of Christ's pre-existence, in general, as well as on that of the creation by him, in particular, is but to little purpose. It is replied, that, in that chapter, the *Logos,* to whose operations the effects there spoken of are ascribed, does not imply a person, but an attribute; and that the work of creation is consequently not attributed to Christ, but to the Wisdom of God the Father. This is not the place to discuss this point. Whoever wishes to see it fully examined, may consult Whitby, Doddridge, and Rosenmüller. To the inquiring reader I would more particularly recommend, upon this head, Pearson *on the Creed*, p. 116—120: Le Clerc, *Nov. Test.* tom. i. p. 392—400: Wits. *Misc. Sacr.* tom. ii. p. 88—118: Whitaker's *Origin of Arianism*, p. 39—114: Howe's *Critical Observations*, vol. iv. p. 38—198: Bishop Tomline's *Elements*, Art. ii., and Dr Laurence's *Dissertation upon the Logos.*

But I am content to rest the whole issue of the question upon the state of the case furnished by the Socinian or Unitarian writers themselves. Let the reader but look into the translation of this chapter by Mr Wakefield, and let him form his judgment of the merits of the Socinian hypothesis, from the mode of expounding Scripture, which he will there find employed for its support. Let him try if he can even comprehend the distinct propositions contained in the first fourteen verses. Let him try if he can annex any definite notions to the assertion, that wisdom (meaning thereby an attribute of God) was God ; or to the assurance, so strongly enforced by repetition, that the wisdom of God was with God ; in other words, that the Deity had not existed before his own essential attributes : — or, again, if he can conceive how the Evangelist (supposing him in his senses) could have thought it necessary, after pronouncing the true light to be God, formally to declare that John was not that light : or, how he could affirm, that the wisdom, of which he had spoken but as an attribute, was made flesh, and became a person, visible, and tangible : — in short, let him try if he does not find, both in the translation and the explanatory notes, as much unintelligible jargon as was ever crowded into the same compass ; nay, as is even, according to Mr Wakefield's notion, to be found in the Athanasian creed itself. This, however, is called a candid and critical investigation of Scripture ; and this, it is to be remembered, is the latest,[6] and therefore, to be supposed the best digested, production of the Socinian school : it comes also from the hands of a writer certainly possessed of classical erudition, — a quality of which few of his Unitarian fellow-labourers in the sister country are entitled to boast.

---

[5] What says the learned dissenter, Mr Peirce, upon such treatment of this passage of Colossians?—"The interpretation which refers what is here said of our Saviour to the new creation, or the renovation of all things, is so forced and violent, that it can hardly be thought that men would ever have espoused it, but for the sake of an hypothesis. The reader may meet with a confutation of it in most commentators."—*Paraphrase,* &c. p. 12. note w.

But, to add one instance more of the ingenious mode of reasoning employed by these writers on the subject of Christ's pre-existence : — in the 8th chap. of John we find our Saviour arguing with the Jews, who, on his asserting that Abraham had seen his day, immediately reply, " Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham ? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I AM." The inference from this, that our Saviour here declared himself to have existed before the time of Abraham, appears not to be a very violent one ; his answer being immediately and necessarily applied to the remark made by the Jews upon his age, which rendered it impossible that he could have seen Abraham : so that this passage will be admitted to be one of those, that " seem directly to assert the pre-existence of Christ." Now, in what way have Socinus and his followers got rid of this seeming contradiction to their opinions ? " Πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγώ εἰμι, must be thus translated : Before Abram can be ABRAHAM, that is, the father of many nations, I must be — the Messiah, or Saviour of the world." This famous discovery, which belongs to Socinus, was indeed esteemed of a nature so far above mere human apprehension, that his nephew, Faustus Socinus, informs us, he had received it from divine inspiration.— " Non sine multis precibus ipsius, Jesû nomine invocato, impetravit ipse." (Socinus *contr. Eutrop.* tom. ii. p. 678.) This sublime interpretation has, it must be confessed, been relinquished by later Socinians, who, in imitation of Grotius, consider Christ as asserting only, that he was before Abraham in the decree of God. But how this could serve as a reply to the objection of the Jews, respecting priority of actual existence ; or how, in this, Christ said any thing of himself, that was not true of every human being, and therefore nugatory ; or why the Jews, upon a declaration so innocent and so unmeaning, should have been fired with rage against him as a blasphemer ; or (if the sense be, that Christ existed in the divine mind antecedent, not to Abraham's birth, but to his existence in the divine mind likewise) what the meaning can be of a priority in the divine foreknowledge, I leave to Mr Belsham and his assistant commentators to unfold. Indeed, this last interpretation seems not to have given entire satisfaction to Socinians themselves, as we find from a paper signed " Discipulus," in the fourth volume of the *Theol. Repos.* in which it is asserted, " that the modern Unitarians have needlessly departed from the interpretation given by Slichtingius, Enjidinus, and other old Socinians, and have adopted another in its stead, which is not to be supported by any just grammatical construction." This gentleman then goes on to furbish up the old Socinian armour, and exults in having rendered it completely proof against all the weapons of Orthodoxy.

Mr Wakefield, however, seems to think it safer to revert to the principles of Grotius's interpretation ; and, accordingly, having fortified it against the charge of grammatical inaccuracy, he presents it in somewhat of a new shape, by translating the passage, " Before Abraham was born, I am HE" — viz. the Messiah. By which, he says, Christ means to imply, that " his mission was settled and certain before the birth of Abraham." That Mr Wakefield has, by this construction, not only avoided the mystical conceits of Socinus's interpretation, but also some of the errors chargeable on that of Grotius, cannot be denied; but, besides that he has built his entire translation of the passage upon the arbitrary assumption of an illipsis, to which the texts quoted as parallel furnish no support whatever, it remains, as before, to be shewn, what intelligible connection subsists between our Lord's answer and the question put to him by the Jews. If he meant merely to say, that his mission, as the Messiah, had been ordained before the birth of Abraham, (which is in itself a tolerable strain upon the words even of this new translation,) it will require all Mr Wakefield's ingenuity to explain in what way this could have satisfied the Jews as to the possibility of Christ's having actually seen Abraham, which is the precise difficulty our Lord proposes to solve by his reply. Doctor Priestley, in his later view of this subject, has not added much in point of clearness or consistency to the Socinian exposition. He confesses, however, that the "literal meaning of our Lord's expressions" in the 56th verse, was, that "he had lived before Abraham," and that it was so considered by the Jews: but at the same time he contends, that our Lord did not intend his words to be so understood; and that, when he afterwards speaks of his priority to Abraham, his meaning is to be thus explained: "that, in a very proper sense of the words, he may be said to have been even before Abraham; the Messiah having been held forth as the great object of hope and joy for the human race, not only to Abraham, but even to his ancestors," (*Notes*, &c. vol. iii. pp. 329, 330. 333, 334.) Such is what Dr Priestley calls the *proper* sense of the words, "Before Abraham was, I am."

---

[6] *Notes on all the Books of Scripture*, by Dr Priestley, have issued from the press since the first edition of this work : and to the exposition there attempted of the introduction of Saint John's Gospel, the remarks, which I have made on Mr Wakefield's translation, apply as aptly, as if for that they had been originally designed. Whoever has a curiosity to discover whether Mr Wakefield or Dr Priestley be the more unintelligible, may consult *Notes*, &c. vol. iii. pp. 18, 19, compared with Mr Wakefield's comment already referred to. In addition to this work, there has yet more lately been given to the public from the Socinian press, what the authors are pleased to call, *An improved Version of the New Testament.* What new lights this improved Version has thrown upon this part of Scripture, will be seen when we come more particularly to notice this performance in another part of this work.

I have here given a very few instances, but such as furnish a fair specimen of the mode of reasoning by which those enlightened commentators, to whom Mr Belsham refers, have been enabled to explain away the direct and evident meaning of Scripture. I have adduced these instances from the arguments which they have used relating to the pre-existence of Christ, as going to the very essence of their scheme of Christianity, (if such it can be called,) and as being some of those on which they principally rely. I have not scrupled to dwell thus long upon a matter not necessarily connected with the subject of these discourses, as some benefit may be derived to the young student in divinity, (for whom this publication has been principally intended,) from exposing the hollowness of the ground on which these high-sounding gentlemen take their stand, whilst they trumpet forth their own extensive knowledge, and the ignorance of those who differ from them. These few instances may serve to give him some idea of the fairness of their pretensions, and the soundness of their criticism. He may be still better able to form a judgment of their powers in scriptural exposition, when he finds, upon trial, that the *formulæ* of interpretation, which have been applied to explain away the notion of Christ's pre-existence from the passages that have been cited, may be employed, with the best success, in arguing away such a meaning from any form of expression that can be devised.

Thus, for example, had it been directly asserted that our Lord had existed for ages before his appearance in this world; it is replied, all this is true, in the decree of God, but it by no means relates to an actual existence. Had Christ, as a proof of his having existed prior to his incarnation, expressly declared, that all things had been created by him; the answer is obvious — he must have been ordained by the divine mind, long before he came into being, as by him it had been decreed, that the great moral creation, whereby a new people should be raised up to God, was to be wrought. Should he go yet farther, and affirm that he had resigned the God-like station which he filled, and degraded himself to the mean condition of man; a ready solution is had for this also — he made no ostentatious display of his miraculous powers, but offered himself to the world like an ordinary man. If any stronger forms of expression should be used, (and stronger can scarcely be had, without recurring to the language of Scripture,) they may all be disposed of in like manner.

But should even all the varieties of critical, logical, and metaphysical refinement be found in any case insufficient, yet still we are not to suppose the point completely given up. The modern Unitarian commentator is not discomfited. He retires with unshaken fortitude within the citadel of his philosophic conviction, and under its impenetrable cover bids defiance to the utmost force of his adversary's argument. Of this let Dr Priestley furnish an instance in his own words. Endeavouring to prove, in opposition to Dr Price, that the expressions in John, vi. 62, "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?" furnish no argument in favour of Christ's pre-existence, he uses the following remarkable language: — that "though not satisfied with any interpretation of this extraordinary passage, yet, rather than believe our Saviour to have existed in any other state before the creation of the world, or to have left some state of great dignity and happiness when he came hither, he would have recourse to the old and exploded Socinian idea of Christ's actual ascent into heaven, or of his imagining that he had been carried up thither in a vision; which, like that of St Paul, he had not been able to distinguish from a reality: nay, he would not build an article of faith of such magnitude, on the correctness of John's recollection and representation of our Lord's language: and so strange and incredible does the hypothesis of a preexistent state appear, that, sooner than admit it, he would suppose the whole verse to be an interpolation, or that the old Apostle dictated one thing, and his amanuensis wrote another." (*Letters to Dr Price*, pp. 57, 58, &c.) — Thus is completed the triumph of Unitarian philosophy over revelation: and thus is the charge of incredulity against the pretended philosopher of the present day refuted! For what is there too monstrous for his belief, if you except only the truths of the Gospel?

No. II.—Page 7. Col. 2.

UNITARIAN OBJECTIONS TO THE RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE OF STATED DAYS.

That the day on which the Saviour of men laid down his life for their transgressions, should have attached to it any feelings of reverence, or should be in any respect distinguished from the number of ordinary days, has long been denied by different classes of dissenters from the established form; forgetting that its celebration was designed to awaken livelier feelings of devotion, by associating circumstances; and not reflecting, that the argument which went to prove that no one day could possess a sanctity above another, should have carried them much farther, and have ended in the abolition of the Sabbath itself. The writer, however, already alluded to in the last number, has, in his answer to Mr Wilberforce's most excellent and truly pious work on the present state of religion, completely removed the charge of inconsistency, by directly asserting, that "Christianity expressly abolishes all distinction of days." — "To a true Christian," he observes, "every day is a sabbath, every place is a temple, and every action of life an act of devotion" — "whatever is lawful or expedient upon any one day of the week, is, under the Christian dispensation, equally lawful and expedient on any other," (Belsham's *Review*, &c. p. 20.)

Lest we should, however, imagine that this writer means to impose upon Christians so severe a duty, as to require them to substitute, for occasional acts of devotion, that unceasing homage, which the unbroken continuity of the Christian's Sabbath, and the ubiquity of his temple, might seem to demand, he informs us (p. 133,) that "a virtuous man is performing his duty to the Supreme Being, as really, and as acceptably, when he is pursuing the proper business of life, or even when enjoying its innocent and decent amusements, as when he is offering direct addresses to him, in the closet, or in the temple." And thus we see the matter is rendered perfectly easy. A Christian may be employed, through the entire of his life, in worshipping his God, by never once thinking of him, but merely pursuing his proper business, or his innocent amusements. This, it is true, is a natural consequence from his first position; and gives to the original argument a consistency, which before it wanted. But is consistency of argument a substitute for Christianity? Or could the teacher of divinity at Hackney have expected, that, from such instructions, his pupils should not so far profit, as to reject not only Christianity, but, many of them, the public worship, and with it the recollection, of a God? — It may be worth while to inquire, what has been the fact, respecting the students of the late academy at Hackney; and, indeed, what is the state of all dissenting academies throughout Great Britain, into which the subverting principles of Unitarianism have made their way. Do any of this description now exist? — And wherefore do they not? — But, on this subject, more in the Appendix.

No. III.—Page 7. Col. 2.

ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION.

There is no one article of the Christian faith which, considered in itself, is more deserving of our closest attention, than that of our redemption by Jesus Christ. This is, in truth, the very corner-stone of the fabric. Against this, accordingly, every framer of a new hypothesis directs his entire force. This once shaken, the whole structure falls in ruins. We therefore find the collective powers of heterodox ingenuity summoned to combat this momentous doctrine, in a work published some years back, entitled the *Theological Repository*. Of what consequence, in the frame and essence of Christianity, it was deemed by the principal marshaller of this controversial host, may be inferred, not only from the great labour he has bestowed on this one subject, (having written five different essays in that work, in opposition to the received doctrine of atonement,) but also from his express declarations. In *Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 429, he pronounces this doctrine to be "one of the radical, as well as the most generally prevailing, corruptions of the Christian scheme;" and in p. 124, he calls it "a disgrace to Christianity, and a load upon it, which it must either throw off, or sink under." And lest the combined exertions of the authors of this work might not prove sufficient to overturn this unchristian tenet, he renews his attack upon it with undiminished zeal in his *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*; among which he ranks this as one of the most important, stating, (vol. i. p. 152,) that "as the doctrine of the Divine Unity was infringed by the introduction of that of the Divinity of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost (as a person distinct from the Father;) so the doctrine of the natural placability of the Divine Being, and our ideas of the equity of his government, have been greatly debased by the gradual introduction of the modern doctrine of atonement." And, on this account, he declares his intention of shewing, in a fuller manner than with respect to any other of the corruptions of Christianity, that it is totally unfounded both in reason and Scripture, and an entire departure from the genuine doctrine of the Gospel. Indeed, the avowed defender of the Socinian heresy must have felt it indispensable to the support of his scheme, to set aside this doctrine. Thus (*Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 272) he says, "it immediately follows from his" (Socinus's) "principles, that Christ being only a man, though ever so innocent, his death could not, in any proper sense of the word, atone for the sins of other men." Accordingly, both in his *History of the Corruptions*, and in the *Theological Repository*, he bends his principal force against this doctrine of our Church. Shall not then so determined a vehemence of attack upon this doctrine, in particular, convince us still more of its importance in the Christian scheme; and point out to the friends of Gospel truth, on what ground they are chiefly to stand in its defence?

No. IV.—Page 8. Col. 2.

PARDON NOT NECESSARILY CONSEQUENT UPON REPENTANCE.

Balguy, in his *Essay on Redemption*, (and after him Dr Holmes,[1]) has argued this point with uncommon strength and clearness. The case of penitence, he remarks, is clearly different from that of innocence: it implies a mixture of guilt pre-contracted, and punishment proportionally deserved. It is consequently inconsistent with rectitude, that both should be treated alike by God. The present conduct of the penitent will receive God's approbation: but the reformation of the sinner cannot have a retrospective effect. The agent may be changed, but his former sins cannot be thereby cancelled: the convert and the sinner are the same individual person: and the agent must be answerable for his whole conduct. The conscience of the penitent furnishes a fair view of the case. His sentiments of himself can be only a mixture of approbation and disapprobation, satisfaction and displeasure. His past sins must still, however sincerely he may have reformed, occasion self-dissatisfaction: and this will even be the stronger, the more he improves in virtue. Now, as this is agreeable to truth, there is reason to conclude that God beholds him in the same light. See Balguy's *Essay*, 1785, p. 31 — 55; and Mr Holmes's *Four Tracts*, p. 138, 139. — The author of the *Scripture Account of Sacrifices*, part i. sect. 6, and part iv. sect. 4, has likewise examined this subject in a judicious manner. — It may be worth remarking also, as Dr Shuckford has done, that Cicero goes no farther on this head than to assert, "Quem pœnitet peccâsse, *penè* est innocens."

Lamentable it is to confess, that the name of Warburton is to be coupled with the defence of the deistical objection, against which the above reasoning is directed. But no less true is it than strange, that in the account of natural religion, which that eminent writer has given, in the ninth book of the *Divine Legation*, he has expressed himself in terms the most unqualified upon the intrinsic and necessary efficacy of repentance; asserting that it is plainly obvious to human reason, from a view of the connection that must subsist between the creature and his Maker, that, whenever man forfeits the favour of God by a violation of the moral law, his sincere repentance *entitles* him to the pardon of his transgressions. — I have been led, with the less reluctance, to notice this pernicious paradox of the learned bishop, because it affords me the opportunity of directing the reader's attention to the judicious and satisfactory refutation which it has lately received, in a prize essay in one of the sister universities. See Mr Pearson's *Critical Essay on the Ninth Book of the Divine Legation*, p. 25 — 34. The reasons that induced Warburton to adopt so heterodox a position are assigned by himself in one of his private letters to his friend Dr Hurd, and are, to the full, as insufficient as the position is untenable. These, together with the alarm given to Dr Hurd by the new doctrine taken up by his friend, will be found noticed in the *Letters from a late eminent Prelate*, p. 421 — 423. — Locke and Nye (as well as Warburton) have given but too much countenance to the erroneous opinion combated in this number.

---

[1] The late Dr Holmes, for some years Canon of Christ Church in Oxford, and afterwards Dean of Winchester. I cannot mention this gentleman's name, without paying to it that tribute of respect which it so justly claims. To his indefatigable and learned research the public is indebted for one of the most valuable additions to biblical literature, which, at this day, it is capable of receiving. Treading in the steps of that great benefactor to the biblical student, Dr Kennicott, he devoted a life to the collection of materials for the emendation of the text of the Septuagint Scriptures, as his distinguished predecessor had done for that of the Hebrew. After the most assiduous, and, to a person not acquainted with the vigour of Dr Holmes's mind, almost incredible labour, in the collation of MSS. and versions, he was enabled to give to the public the valuable result of his inquiries, in one complete volume of the Pentateuch, and the Book of Daniel. That it was not allotted to him to finish the great work in which he had engaged, is most deeply to be regretted. It is, however, to be hoped, that the learned University, on whose reputation his labours have reflected additional lustre, will not permit an undertaking of such incalculable utility to the Christian world to remain unaccomplished, especially as the materials for its prosecution, which the industry of Dr Holmes has so amply supplied, and which remain deposited in the Bodleian Library, must leave comparatively but little to be done for its final execution. The preface to the volume which has been published concludes with these words: — "Hoc unum superest monendum, quod Collationes istæ ex omni genere, quæ ad hoc opus per hos quindecim annos jam fuerunt elaboratæ, in Bibliothecâ Bodleianâ reponantur, atque vel a me, si vivam et valeam, vel, si aliter acciderit, ab alio quodam Editore, sub auspicio Colendissimorum Typographei Clarendoniani Oxoniensis Curatorum, in publicum emittentur." — The language also of the valuable and much to be lamented author, (with whom I was personally acquainted, and had for some years the satisfaction of corresponding,) was always such as to encourage the expectation here held out. That this expectation should be gratified, and with all practicable despatch, cannot but be the anxious wish of every person interested in the pure and unadulterated exposition of Scripture truth.

No. V.—Page 9. Col. 1.

THE SENSE ENTERTAINED BY MANKIND OF THE NATURAL INEFFICACY OF REPENTANCE, PROVED FROM THE HISTORY OF HUMAN SACRIFICES.

If we look to the practices of the Heathen world, we shall find the result of the reasoning, which is advanced in the page referred to, confirmed from experience by abundant proof. We shall find that almost the entire of the religion of the Pagan nations consisted in rites of deprecation. Fear of the Divine displeasure seems to have been the leading feature in their religious impressions; and in the diversity, the costliness, and the cruelty, of their sacrifices, they sought to appease Gods, to whose wrath they felt themselves exposed, from a consciousness of sin, unrelieved by any information as to the means of escaping its effects. So strikingly predominant was this feature of terror in the Gentile superstitions, that we find it expressly laid down by the Father of Grecian history, *τὸ Θεῖον ϖᾶν φθονεϱόν τε ϰαὶ ταϱαχῶδες* (Herod, lib. i. cap. 32 :) and Porphyry directly asserts, "that there was wanting some universal method of delivering men's souls, which no sect of philosophy had ever yet found out :" (August. *de Civit. Dei*, lib. x. cap. 32) — that is, that something besides their own repentance was wanting to appease the anger of their Gods.

The universal prevalence of human sacrifices, throughout the Gentile world, is a decisive proof of the light in which the human mind, unaided by Revelation, is disposed to view the Divinity, and clearly evinces how little likelihood there is in the supposition, that unassisted reason could discover the sufficiency of repentance to regain the favour of an offended God. Of this savage custom, M. de Pauw (*Rech. Phil. sur les Améric.* vol. i. p. 211) asserts, that there is no nation mentioned in history whom we cannot reproach with having, more than once, made the blood of its citizens stream forth, in holy and pious ceremonies, to appease the Divinity when he appeared angry, or to move him when he appeared indolent.

Of this position, both ancient and modern historians supply the fullest confirmation. Heliodorus (*Æthiopic.* lib. x. p. 465, ed. 1630) informs us, that the Ethiopians were required by their laws to sacrifice boys to the sun, and girls to the moon. Sanchoniathon, as quoted by Philo, (Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* lib. i. cap. 10,) asserts, that among the Phœnicians it was customary, in great and public calamities, for princes and magistrates to offer up, in sacrifice to the avenging demons, the dearest of their offspring, *εἰς λύτϱον τοῖς τιμωϱοῖς δαίμοσι.* This practice is also attributed to them by Porphyry (Euseb. *P. Ev.* lib. iv.) Herodotus (lib. iv. cap. 62) describes it as a custom with the Scythians to sacrifice every hundredth man of their prisoners to their God Mars. And Keysler, who has carefully investigated the antiquities of that race, represents the spreading oaks, under which they were used to perform their sanguinary rites, as being always profusely sprinkled with the blood of the expiring victims, (*Antiq. Septentr.* Dissert. iii.) Of the Egyptians, Diodorus relates it (lib. i. p. 99, ed. Wessel.) to have been an established practice, to sacrifice red-haired men at the tomb of Osiris; from which, he says, misunderstood by the Greeks, arose the fable of the bloody rites of Busiris. This charge brought by Diodorus against the Egyptians is supported by Plutarch, on the authority of Manetho, (*Isid. et Osir.* p. 380.) At Heliopolis, also, three men were daily offered up to Lucina; which practice, Porphyry informs us, was put a stop to by Amasis, (see Wessel. Diod. p. 99, n. 86.) And we are told by an Arabian writer, Murtadi, that it had been customary with the Egyptians to sacrifice, to the river Nile, a young and beautiful virgin, by flinging her, decked in the richest attire, into the stream: and, as Mr Maurice remarks, a vestige of this barbarous custom remains to this day; for we learn from Mr Savary's *Letters on Egypt*, (vol. i. p. 118,) that the Egyptians annually make a clay statue in the form of a woman, and throw it into the river, previous to the opening of the dam — see Maurice's *Indian Antiquities*, p. 433.

That this cruel practice existed also among the Chinese, appears from their histories, which record the oblation of their monarch Chingtang, in pacification of their offended deity, and to avert from the nation the dreadful calamities with which it was at that time visited. This sacrifice, it is added, was pronounced by the priests to be demanded by the will of Heaven: and the aged monarch is represented as supplicating at the altar, that his life may be accepted, as an atonement for the sins of the people, (Martin. *Hist. Sin.* lib. iii. p. 75, ed. 1659.) — Even the Persians, whose mild and beneficent religion appears at this day so repugnant to this horrid usage, were not exempt from its contagion. Not only were their sacred rites, like those of other nations, stained with the blood of immolated victims, as may be seen in Herodotus (lib. i. cap. 132, and lib. vii. cap. 113,) Xenophon (*Cyrop.* lib. viii.) Arrian (*De Exped. Alex.* lib. vi. ad finem,) Ovid (*Fast.* lib. i.) Strabo (lib. xv. p. 1065, ed. 1707,) Suidas (in Μιθρα;) and, as is fully proved by Brissonius (*De Reg. Pers. Princ.* lib. ii. a cap. v. ad cap. xliii.): but Herodotus (lib. vii. cap. 114,) expressly pronounces it to have been the Persian custom to offer human victims by inhumation; Περσικὸν δὲ τὸ ζώοντας κατορύσσειν: and, in support of his position, adduces two striking instances of the fact; in one of which his testimony is corroborated by that of Plutarch. The mysteries also of the Persian God Mithra, and the discovery of the Mithriac sepulchral cavern, as described by Mr Maurice, have led that writer, in the most decisive manner, to affix to the Persian votary the charge of human sacrifice, (*Indian Antiquities*, pp. 965, 984, &c.) — The ancient Indians, likewise, however their descendants at this day may be described by Mr Orme (*Hist. of Indost.* vol. i. p. 5,) as of a nature utterly repugnant to this sanguinary rite, are represented both by Sir W. Jones (*Asiat. Res.* vol. i. p. 265,) and Mr Wilkins (in his *Explanatory Notes on the Heetopades*, note 292,) as having been polluted by the blood of human victims. This savage practice appears also to have been enjoined by the very code of Brahma; as may be seen in the *Asiatic Researches*, as already referred to. The self-devotions, so common among this people, tend likewise to confirm the accusation. On these, and the several species of meritorious suicide extracted from the *Ayeen Akbery*, by Mr Maurice, see *Ind. Antiq.* pp. 164, 166. The ame writer asserts (p. 434,) that the Mahometans have exerted themselves for the abolition of this unnatural usage, both in India and Egypt. This author, indeed, abounds with proofs, establishing the fact of human sacrifice in Ancient India.

Of the same horrid nature were the rites of he early Druids, as may be seen in Diod. Sic. vol. i. pp. 354, 355, ed. Wess.) The Massilian Grove of the Gallic Druids is described by Lucan, in his *Pharsalia*, (lib. iii. 400, &c.) in terms that make the reader shudder: — that every branch was reeking with human ore," is almost the least chilling of the poetic orrors with which he has surrounded this readful sanctuary of Druidical superstition. Ve are informed, that it was the custom of he Gallic Druids to set up an immense gigantic figure of a wicker man, in the texture of which they entwined above an hundred human ictims, and then consumed the whole as an ffering to their gods. For a delineation of his monstrous spectacle, see Clarke's *Cæsar*, . 131, fol. ed. 1712. Nor were the Druids of Iona less cruel in their religious ceremonies than their brethren of Gaul: Tacitus (vol. ii. p. 172, ed. Brot.) represents it as their constant usage, to sacrifice to their gods the prisoners taken in war: "cruore captivo adolere aras, fas habebant." In the Northern nations these tremendous mysteries were usually buried in the gloom of the thickest woods. In the extended wilds of Arduenna, and the great Hercynian forest particularly, places set apart for this dreadful purpose abounded.

Phylarchus, as quoted by Porphyry, affirms, that, of old, it was a rule with every Grecian state, before they marched against an enemy, to supplicate their gods by human victims; and, accordingly, we find human sacrifices attributed to the Thebans, Corinthians, Messenians, and Temessenses, by Pausanias: to the Lacedæmonians by Fulgentius, Theodoret, and Apollodorus; and to the Athenians by Plutarch, (Themist. p. 262, et Arist. p. 300, ed. Bryan;) and it is notorious, that the Athenians, as well as the Massilians, had a custom of sacrificing a man every year, after loading him with dreadful curses, that the wrath of the gods might fall upon his head, and be turned away from the rest of the citizens. — See Suidas on the words περίψημα, κάθαρμα, and φαρμακός.

The practice prevailed also among the Romans; as appears not only from the devotions so frequent in the early periods of their history, but from the express testimonies of Livy, Plutarch, and Pliny. In the year of Rome 657, we find a law enacted in the Consulship of Lentulus and Crassus, by which it was prohibited: but it appears, notwithstanding, to have been in existence so late even as in the reign of Trajan; for, at this time, three Vestal virgins having been punished for incontinence, the Pontiffs, on consulting the books of the Sibyls to know whether a sufficient atonement had been made, and finding that the offended Deity continued incensed, ordered two men and two women, Greeks and Gauls, to be buried alive, (*Univ. Hist.* vol. xiv. p. 588, ed. Dub.) Porphyry also assures us, that, even in his time, a man was every year sacrificed at the shrine of Jupiter Latialis.

The same cruel mode of appeasing their offended gods we find ascribed to all the other Heathen nations: to the Getæ, by Herodotus (lib. iv. c. 94;) to the Leucadians, by Strabo (lib. x. p. 694;) to the Goths, by Jordandes (*De Reb. Getic.* cap. xix.;) to the Gauls, by Cicero (*pro Fonteio*, p. 487, ed. 1684,) and by Cæsar (*Bell. Gall.* lib. vi. sec. 15;) to the Heruli, by Procop. (*Bell. Goth.* lib. ii. c. 15;) to the Britons, by Tacitus (*Annal.* xiv. 30,) and by Pliny (lib. xxx. cap. 1;) to the Germans, by Tacitus (*De Mor. Germ.* cap. ix.;) to the Carthaginians, by Sanchoniathon (Euseb. *P. Ev.* lib. i. cap. 10,) by Plato (in Minoe, *Opera*, p. 565, ed. 1602,) by Pliny (lib. xxxvi. cap. 12,) by Silius Italicus (lib.

iv. lin. 767, &c.) and by Justin (lib. xviii. cap. 6, and lib. xix. cap. 1.) Ennius says of them, (ed. Hess. 1707, p. 28,) "Poenei sont soliti sos sacruficare puellos." They are reported,by Diodorus, to have offered two hundred human victims at once: and to so unnatural an extreme was this horrid superstition carried by this people, that it was usual for the parent himself to slaughter the dearest and most beautiful of his offspring at the altars of their bloody deities. Scripture proves the practice to have existed in Canaan before the Israelites came thither, (Levit. xx. 23.) Of the Arabians, the Cretans, the Cyprians, the Rhodians, the Phocæans, those of Chios, Lesbos, and Tenedos, the same may be established; see Porphyr. apud Euseb. *P. Ev.* lib. iv. cap. 16. Monimus, as quoted by Clem. Alexand. (Euseb. ibid,) affirms the same of the inhabitants of Pella. And Euripides has given to the bloody altars of the Tauric Diana a celebrity that rejects additional confirmation. — So that the universality of the practice in the ancient Heathen world cannot reasonably be questioned.

In what light, then, the Heathens of antiquity considered their deities, and how far they were under the impression of the existence of a Supreme Benevolence requiring nothing but repentance and reformation of life, may be readily inferred from this review of facts. Agreeably to the inference which these furnish, we find the reflecting Tacitus pronounce (*Hist.* lib. i. cap. 3,) "that the gods interfere in human concerns, but to punish — Non esse curæ deis securitatem nostram, esse ultionem." And in this he seems but to repeat the sentiments of Lucan, who, in his *Pharsalia*, (iv. 107, &c.) thus expresses himself:—

> "Felix Roma, quidem, civesque habitura beatos,
> Si libertatis Superis tam cura placeret,
> Quam vindicta placet ——"

On this subject the Romans appear to have inherited the opinions of the Greeks. Meiners (*Historia Doctrinæ de vero Deo*, p. 208) asserts that the more ancient Greeks imagined their gods to be envious of human felicity; so that, whenever any great success attended them, they were filled with terror, lest the gods should be offended at it, and bring on them some dreadful calamity. In this the learned professor but affirms what, we have seen, (p. 30,) is the formal declaration attributed to Solon by Herodotus: a declaration repeated and confirmed by the historian, in the instances of Polycrates and Xerxes: in the former of which, the prudent Amasis grounds his alarm for the safety of the too prosperous prince of Samos on the notoriety of the envious nature of the divine being, *τὸ ϑεῖον ἐπισταμένῳ ὡς ἔστι φθονερόν* (lib. iii. cap. 40) — and in the latter, the sage Artabanus warns Xerxes, that even the blessings which the gods bestow in this life are derived from an envious motive, *ὁ δὲ ϑεὸς, γλυκὺν γεύσας τὸν αἰῶνα φθονερὸς ἐν αὐτῷ εὑρίσκεται ἐών* (lib. vii. cap. 46.) That fear of the gods, was not an unusual attendant on the belief of their existence, may be inferred likewise from the saying of Plutarch (*De Superst.*) *τέλος τοῦ μὴ νομίζειν ϑεοὺς μὴ φοβεῖσθαι*: and Pliny, (lib. ii. cap. 7,) speaking of the deification of death, diseases, and plagues, says, that "these are ranked among the gods, whilst with a trembling fear we desire to have them pacified, — dum esse placatas, trepido metu cupimus." Cudworth also (*Intell. Syst.* p. 664,) shews, in the instances of Democritus and Epicurus, that terror was attached to the notion of a divine existence: and that it was with a view to get free from this terror, that Epicurus laboured to remove the idea of a providential administration of human affairs. The testimony of Plato is likewise strong to the same purpose: speaking of the punishment of wicked men, he says, all these things "hath Nemesis decreed to be executed in the second period, by the ministry of vindictive terrestrial demons, who are overseers of human affairs; to which demons the Supreme God hath committed the government of this world." — *De Anima Mundi. Opera*, p. 1096, ed. Franc. 1602.

Thus the Gentile religion, in early ages, evidently appears to have been a religion of fear. The same it has been found likewise in later times; and such it continues to this day. Of the length of time during which this practice of human sacrifice continued among the Northern nations, Mr Thorkelin, who was perfectly conversant with Northern literature, furnishes several instances, in his *Essay on the Slave Trade.* Ditmarus charges the Danes with having put to death, in their great sacrifices, no fewer than ninety-nine slaves at once (Loccen. *Antiq. Sue. Goth.* lib. i. cap. 3.) In Sweden, on urgent occasions, and particularly in times of scarcity and famine, they sacrificed kings and princes. Loccenius (*Histor. Rer Suecic.* lib. i. p. 5) gives the following account: "Tantâ fame Suecia afflicta est, ut e vix gravior unquam incubuerit; cives inte se dissidentes, cum pœnam delictorum divinam agnoscerent, primo anno boves, altero homines tertio, regem ipsum, velut iræ cœlestis piaculum, ut sibi persuasum habebant, Odino immolabant:" and we are told that the Swedes at one time, boasted of having sacrificed fiv kings in a single day. Adam of Bremen (*Hist. Eccles.* cap. 234,) speaking of the awfu grove of Upsal, a place distinguished for th celebration of those horrid rites, says, "Ther was not a single tree in it, that was not reverenced, as gifted with a portion of the divinity, because stained with gore, and foul with human putrefaction." In all the other Norther nations, without exception, the practice found to have prevailed: and to so late period did it continue, that we learn from St Boniface, that Gregory II. was obliged to make the sale of slaves for sacrifice by the German converts, a capital offence; and Carloman, in the year 743, found it necessary to pass a law for its prevention. Mallet, whose account of this horrid custom among the Northern nations deserves particularly to be attended to, affirms that it was not abolished in those regions until the ninth century, (*Northern Antiquities,* vol. i. pp. 132 — 142.) And Jortin (*Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* vol. v. p. 233) reports, from Fleury, an adherence to this custom, in the island of Rugia, even so late as at the close of the twelfth century.

The same dreadful usage is found to exist, to this day, in Africa; where, in the inland parts, they sacrifice the captives, taken in war, to their fetiches: as appears from Snelgrave, who, in the king of Dahoome's camp, was witness to his sacrificing multitudes to the deity of his nation. Among the islanders of the South Seas we likewise learn from Captain Cook, that human sacrifices were very frequent: he speaks of them as customary in Otaheitè, and the Sandwich Islands; and in the island of Tongataboo he mentions ten men offered at one festival. All these, however, are far exceeded by the pious massacre of human beings in the nations of America. The accounts given by Acosta, Gomara, and other Spanish writers, of the monstrous carnage of this kind, in these parts of the world, are almost incredible. The annual sacrifices of the Mexicans required many thousands of victims; and in Peru two hundred children were devoted for the health of the Ynca. (Acost. *Hist. of Ind.* pp. 379—388, ed. 1604. —Anton. de Solis. and Clavig. *Hist. of Mex.* lib. vi. sect. 18, 19, 20.)—Mr Maurice also informs us, that, at this day, among certain tribes of the Mahrattas, human victims, distinguished by their beauty and youthful bloom, are fattened like oxen for the altar (*Ind. Antiq.* p. 843.); and the same writer (pp. 1077, 1078) instances other facts from Mr Crauford's *Sketches of Indian Mythology,* from which he concludes, that the notion of the efficacy of human sacrifice is by no means extinct in India at the present time. This position is certainly contradictory to the testimonies of Dow, Holwel, and Grose. But, as the laborious research of Mr Maurice has drawn together numerous and authentic documents in corroboration of his opinion, it may fairly be questioned whether the authority of these writers is to be considered as of much weight in the opposite scale. The learned professor Meiners (*Historia Doct. de vero Deo.* sect. iv.) does not hesitate to pronounce the two former unentitled to credit: the first, as being of a disposition too credulous; and the second, as deserving to be reckoned, for fiction and folly, another Megasthenes.[1] Mr Dow's incompetency, on the subject of the Indian theology, has also been proved by Mr Halhed, who has shewn, in the preface to his translation of the *Gentoo Code,* (p. 32, ed. 1776,) that writer's total deficiency in the knowledge of the sacred writings of the Hindoos; and as to Mr Grose, I refer the reader to the *Indian Antiquities* (pp. 249, 255) for instances of his superficial acquaintance with the affairs of Hindostan. It is of the greater importance to appreciate truly the value of the testimony given by these writers; as on their reports has been founded a conclusion directly subversive of the fact here attempted to be established.[2]

---

[1] In addition to the authorities already referred to upon this head, I would suggest to the reader a perusal of Mr Mickle's *Enquiry into the Brahmin Philosophy,* suffixed to the seventh Book of his Translation of Camoens' *Lusiad.* He will find in that interesting summary abundant proofs not only of the existence of the practice of human sacrifice in modern India, but also of the total incredibility of the romances of Dow and Holwel; and he will at the same time discover the reason why these authors are viewed with so much partiality by a certain description of writers. The philosophic tincture of their observations upon religion, and the liberties taken, by Mr Holwel especially, with both the Mosaic and Christian revelations, were too nearly allied to the spirit of Unitarianism not to have had charms for the advocates of that system. — The superiority of the revelation of Brahma over that of Moses, Mr Holwel instances in the creation of man. In the former, he says, " the creation of the human form is clogged with no difficulties, no ludicrous unintelligible circumstances, or inconsistencies. God previously constructs mortal bodies of both sexes for the reception of the angelic spirits," (Mickle's *Lusiad,* vol. ii. p. 253.) Mr Holwell, also, in his endeavours to prove the revelation of Birmah and of Christ to be the same, gravely proceeds to solve the difficulty which arises from their present want of resemblance, by asserting, that " the doctrine of Christ, as it is delivered to us, is totally corrupted; that age after age has discoloured it; that even the most ancient record of its history, the New Testament, is grossly corrupted; that St Paul by his reveries, and St Peter by his sanction to kill and eat, began this woful declension and perversion of the doctrines of Christ," (Mickle's *Lusiad,* vol. ii. p. 254.) After this, can we wonder, that Dr Priestley considered this writer sufficiently enlightened, to be admitted as undoubted evidence in the establishment of whatever facts he might be pleased to vouch? Yet it is whimsical enough, that this writer, who is so eminently philosophical, and, as such, is so favourite a witness with Dr Priestley, should have disclosed an opinion with respect to philosophers, so disreputable as the following: — " The devil and his chiefs have often, as well as the good angels, taken the human form, and appeared in the character of tyrants, and corrupters of morals, or of philosophers, who are the devil's faithful deputies," (Mickle's *Lusiad,* vol. ii. p. 250.)

[2] To the curious reader, who may wish to see the latest and most interesting account of the sanguinary superstitions of the Hindoos, and of the general state of that people in point of civilisation at the present day, I would strongly recommend Dr Buchanan's *Memoir on the Expediency of an Ecclesiastical Establishment for British India;* in which he will not only find ample confirmation of Mr Maurice's statements, as to the dreadful extent of human sacrifice among the natives of Hindostan (see pp. 33, 34, 47—50, 91—104,) but also the most affecting exposition of the decaying state of religion amongst their conquerors.

In this latter point of view, it is a work that cannot be too generally known, nor too attentively perused. The contrast which it exhibits between the indifference of Protestantism and the zeal of Popery, in those distant regions, is strikingly illustrative of the prevailing character of each. An establishment of

The subject of this Number may derive additional light from the nature of the representations of the Divinity, throughout the Heathen nations. Thus, in the images of the Deity among the Indians, we find an awful and terrific power the ruling feature. Thousands of outstretched arms and hands, generally filled with swords and daggers, bows and arrows, and every instrument of destruction, express to the terrified worshipper the cruel nature of the god. The collars of human skulls, the forked tongues shooting from serpents' jaws, the appendages of mutilated corpses, and all the other circumstances of terrific cruelty which distinguish the Black Goddess Seeva, Haree, and other of the idols of Hindostan (Maurice's *Ind. Antiq.* pp. 182, 253, 327, 381, 382, 856, 857, 882,) sufficiently manifest the genius of that religion which presented these as objects of adoration. To the hideous idols of Mexico, one of which was of most gigantic size, seated upon huge snakes, and expressly denominated *Terror*, (Clavig. lib. vi. sect. 6,) it was usual to present the heart, torn from the breast of the human victim, and to insert it, whilst yet warm, in the jaws of the blood-thirsty divinity, (Ibid. lib. vi. sect. 18.) The supreme god of the ancient Scythians was worshipped by them under the similitude of a naked sword, (Herod. lib. iv. cap. 62;) and in Valhalla, or the Hall of Slaughter, the Paradise of the terrible god of the Northern European regions, the cruel revelries of Woden were celebrated by deep potations from the skulls of enemies slain in battle.

In conformity with this character of their gods, we find the worship of many of the heathen nations to consist in suffering and mortification, in cutting their flesh with knives, and scorching their limbs with fire. Of these unnatural and inhuman exercises of devotion, ancient history supplies numberless instances.

---

eighteen military chaplains, of whom not more than twelve are at any one time in actual appointment, — with three churches, one at Calcutta, one at Madras, and one at Bombay, — constitutes the entire means of religious instruction for the vast extent of the British empire in the East; whilst, at the various settlements and factories, at Bencoolen, Canton, and the numerous islands in that quarter in the possession of Britain, not a single clergyman of the English Church is to be found, to perform the rite of baptism, or any other Christian rite whatever. British armies, also, have been known to be not unfrequently in the field without a chaplain; and it is said, that Marquis Cornwallis was indebted to the services of a British officer, for the last solemn offices of interment. The consequence (as Dr Buchanan states) has been, that "all respect for Christian institutions has worn away; and that the Christian Sabbath is now no otherwise distinguished, than by the display of the British flag!" So that, "we seem at present," he says, "to be trying the question, Whether religion be necessary for a state; whether a remote, commercial empire, having no sign of the Deity, no type of any thing heavenly, may not yet maintain its Christian purity and its political strength, amidst Pagan superstitions, and a voluptuous and unprincipled people." The effect also of this want of religious instruction Dr Buchanan describes to be such as might naturally be expected, — a general spread of profligacy amongst our own people, and a firm belief amongst the natives, that "the English have no religion."

Now, in what way does Dr Buchanan describe the exertions of the Romish Church to propagate its peculiar tenets? An establishment of three archbishops and seventeen bishops, with a proportional number of churches and inferior clergy, is indefatigably employed in sending through the East, and particularly through the dominions of Protestant Britain, that form of religious faith, which Protestants condemn as perniciously erroneous. In Bengal alone, he states, there are eight Romish churches, besides four Armenian and two Greek: and it affords matter of melancholy reflection, that we are compelled to derive a consolation under the consequences of our own religious apathy, from the contemplation of those beneficial effects, which Dr Buchanan ascribes to the influence of this Romish establishment, in its civilizing operation on the minds of the Asiatics.

The sentiments, which an acquaintance with these facts must naturally excite in the minds of such as retain any sense of the value of true religion, make it particularly desirable that this work should be known to all; especially to those who have the power to promote the means of rectifying the dreadful evils which it authenticates. To a religious mind, the perusal of the work must undoubtedly be distressing. But, from the gloom, which the darkness of Pagan superstition, joined to the profligacy of European irreligion, spreads over the recitals it contains, the pious heart will find relief in that truly evangelical production of pastoral love, presented in Archbishop Wake's primary charge to the Protestant missionaries in India; and yet more in that delightful picture which is given of the church at Malabar: — a church, which, as it is reported to have been of Apostolic origin, carries with it to this day the marks of Apostolic simplicity; and which presents the astonishing phenomenon of a numerous body of Hindoo Christians, equalling, both in their practice and their doctrines, the purity of any Christian church since the age of the Apostles. "Such are the heresies of this church," said their Portuguese accusers, "that their clergy married wives; that they owned but two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's supper; that they denied transubstantiation; that they neither invoked saints nor believed in purgatory; and that they had no other orders or names of dignity in the church than bishop or deacon." Such was found to be the state of the church of Malabar in the year 1599; and such, there is good reason to believe, had been its state, from its foundation in the earliest times of Christianity. (See Dr Buchanan's *Memoir*, pp. 1—8, 12, 18, 55—62, 75—79.) To the question which Popery triumphantly proposes to the Protestant, "Where was your religion before Luther?" the answer, "In the Bible," derives now an auxiliary from this most important and interesting fact.

I should deem it necessary to apologize to the reader for this digression respecting the contents of Dr Buchanan's publication, were I not convinced, that, in drawing attention to its subject, I am doing a real service to Christianity.

As a most valuable Appendix to this publication, I must beg leave also to recommend to the reader the eighteenth article of the 1st volume of the *Quarterly Review*. The impious policy, that would impede the introduction of the Christian religion into India, is there treated as it deserves. The fashionable sophistry which had for a time prevailed upon this subject, is most happily exposed by the Reviewer. And, with no common talent and address, it is unanswerably proved to be no less the interest, than the duty, of the conqueror, to spread the light of the Gospel far and wide through the regions of Hindostan. Melancholy it truly is, that such arguments should be wanted to convince a Christian people. Great is the power of the British empire most undoubtedly. Yet, surely, if its interests are found to be incompatible with the interests of Christ's kingdom, it cannot be difficult to pronounce which of the two must fall.

That the reader may feel the full force of the observations contained in this note, he is requested to peruse the extraordinary details, authenticated by Dr Buchanan, in his recent publication, entitled *Christian Researches in Asia;* particularly those relating to the worship of Juggernaut, and the present condition of Ceylon, which are to be found at pp. 129—147, and pp. 182—190 of that work. These details must be alarming indeed to every serious mind.

In the worship of Baal, as related in the Book of Kings, and in the consecration to Moloch, as practised by the Ammonites, and not infrequently by the Hebrews themselves, the sacred volume affords an incontestable record of this diabolical superstition. Similar practices are attested by almost every page of the profane historian. The cruel austerities of the Gymnosophist, both of Africa and India, the dreadful sufferings of the initiated votaries of Mithra and Eleusis, (see Maurice's *Ind. Antiq.* pp. 990—1000,) the Spartan διαμαστίγωσις in honour of Diana, the frantic and savage rites of Bellona, and the horrid self-mutilations of the worshippers of Cybele, but too clearly evince the dreadful views entertained by the ancient heathens of the nature of their gods. Of the last named class of pagan devotees, (to instance one, as a specimen of all,) we have the following account from Augustine: — "Deæ magnæ sacerdotes, qui Galli vocabantur, virilia sibi amputabant, et furore perciti caput rotabant, cultrisque faciem musculosque totius corporis dissecabant; morsibus quoque se ipsos impetebant." (August. *de Civ. Dei.* pp. 140, 156, ed. 1661.) And Seneca, as quoted by the same writer, (lib. vi. cap. 10,) confirms this report in the following passage, taken from his work on *Superstition*, now no longer extant: — "Ille viriles sibi partes amputat, ille lacertos secat. Ubi iratos deos timent, qui sic propitios merentur? — Tantus est perturbatæ mentis et sedibus suis pulsæ furor, ut sic dii placentur quemadmodum ne homines quidem teterrimi. — Se ipsi in templis contrucidant, vulneribus suis ac sanguine supplicant." And it deserves to be remarked, that these unnatural rites, together with that most unnatural of all — human sacrifice — are pronounced by Plutarch (*Opera*, tom. ii. p. 417, ed. Franc. 1620) to have been instituted for the purpose of averting the wrath of malignant demons.

Nor have these cruel modes of worship been confined to the heathens of antiquity. By the same unworthy conceptions of the Deity, the pagans of later times have been led to the same unworthy expressions of their religious feelings. Thus, in the narrative of Cooke's *Voyages*, we are informed, that it was usual with the inhabitants of the Friendly Islands, when afflicted with any dangerous disorder, to cut off their little finger as an offering to the Deity, which they deemed efficacious to procure their recovery: and in the Sandwich Islands, it was the custom to strike out the fore-teeth, as a propitiatory sacrifice, to avert the anger of the Eatooa, or Divinity. If we look again to the religion of the Mexicans, we meet the same sort of savage superstition, but carried to a more unnatural excess. Clavigero (lib. vi. sect. 22) says, "It makes one shudder to read the austerities which they exercised upon themselves, either in atonement of their transgressions, or in preparation for their festivals:" and then proceeds, in this and the following sections, to give a dreadful description indeed, of the barbarous self-lacerations, practised both by the Mexicans and Tlascalans in the discharge of their religious duties: and yet, he afterwards asserts, (vol. ii. p. 446, 4to. ed. Lond.) that all these, horrid as they are, must be deemed inconsiderable, when compared with the inhumanities of the ancient priests of Bellona and Cybele, of whom we have already spoken; and still more so, when contrasted with those of the penitents of the East Indies and Japan.

With good reason, indeed, has the author made this concluding remark: for of the various austerities which have been at different times practised as means of propitiating superior powers, there are none that can be ranked with those of the devotees of Hindostan at the present day. Dreadful as Mr Maurice represents the rites of Mithra and Eleusis to have been, dreadful as we find the other rites that have been noticed, yet their accumulated horrors fall infinitely short of the penitentiary tortures endured by the Indian Yogee, the Gymnosophist of modern times — "to suspend themselves on high in cages, upon trees considered sacred, refusing all sustenance, but such as may keep the pulse of life just beating; to hang aloft upon tenter-hooks, and voluntarily bear inexpressible agonies; to thrust themselves by hundreds, under the wheels of immense machines, that carry about their unconscious gods, where they are instantly crushed to atoms; at other times, to hurl themselves from precipices of stupendous height; now to stand up to their necks in rivers, till rapacious alligators come to devour them; now to bury themselves in snow till frozen to death; to measure with their naked bodies, trained over burning sands, the ground lying between one pagoda and another, distant perhaps many leagues; or to brave, with fixed eyes, the ardour of a meridian sun between the tropics:" these, with other penances not less tremendous, which Mr Maurice has fully detailed in the last volume of his *Indian Antiquities*, are the means whereby the infatuated worshippers of Brahma hope to conciliate the Deity, and to obtain the blessings of immortality: and by these, all hope to attain those blessings, except only the wretched race of the Chandalahs, whom, by the unalterable laws of Brahma, no repentance, no mortification, can rescue from the doom of eternal misery, and against whom the gates of happiness are for ever closed. — See Maur. *Ind. Antiq.* pp. 960, 961.

Now, from this enumeration of facts, it seems not difficult to decide, whether the dictate of untutored reason be the conviction of the Divine benevolence, and the persuasion that the Supreme Being is to be conciliated by good and virtuous conduct alone: and from this also we shall be enabled to judge what degree of credit is due to the assertions of those who pronounce, that "all men naturally apprehend the Deity to be propitious:" that "no nation whatever, either Jew or Heathen, ancient or modern, appears to have had the least knowledge, or to betray the least sense of their want of any expedient of satisfaction for sin, besides repentance and a good life:" and, that, "from a full review of the religions of all ancient and modern nations, they appear to be utterly destitute of any thing like a doctrine of proper atonement."

These assertions Doctor Priestley has not scrupled to make (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. pp. 401, 411, 416, and 421;) and boldly offers "the range of the whole Jewish and Heathen world" to supply a single fact in contradiction. He professes also to survey this wide extended range himself; and, for this purpose, begins with adducing a single passage from Virgil, whence, he says, it appears that "even the implacable hatred of Juno could be appeased;" and an instance from the *Phædon* of Plato, from which he concludes that Socrates, although "the farthest possible from the notion of appeasing the anger of the gods by any external services, yet died without the least doubt of an happy immortality;" notwithstanding that in p. 31, when treating of another subject, he had found it convenient to represent this philosopher as utterly disbelieving a future state; and even here, he adds, what renders his whole argument a nullity, "provided there were any such state for man." Having by the former of these established his position as to the religion of the vulgar among the Greeks and Romans, and by the latter, as to the religion of the philosophers, he yet farther endeavours to fortify his conclusion by the assertion, that no facts have been furnished either by Gale or Clarke, to justify the opinion that the ancients were at a loss as to the terms of divine acceptance; notwithstanding that not only Clarke, (*Evidences*, vol. ii. pp. 662—670, fol. 1738,) but Leland, (*Christ. Rev.* vol. i. pp. 259, 270, 473, 4to. 1764,) and various other writers have collected numerous authorities on this head, and that the whole mass of heathen superstitions speaks no other language; insomuch that Bolingbroke himself (vol. v. pp. 214, 215, 4to.) admits the point in its fullest extent. He next proceeds to examine the religion of the ancient Persians and modern Parsis. To prove this people to have been free from any idea of atonement or sacrifice, he quotes a prayer from Dr Hyde, and a description of their notion of future punishments from Mr Grose: and though these can, at the utmost, apply only to the present state of the people, (and whoever will consult Dr Hyde's *History*, pp. 570, 574, on the account given by Tavernier, of their notion of Absolution, and on that given by himself, of their ceremony of the Scape-Dog, will see good reason to deny the justness even of this application,) yet Dr Priestley has not scrupled to extend the conclusion derived from them to the ancient Persians, in defiance of the numerous authorities referred to in this Number, and notwithstanding that, as Mr Richardson asserts, (*Dissert.* pp. 25, 26, 8vo. 1778,) the Parsis acknowledge the original works of their ancient lawgiver to have been long lost; and that, consequently, the ceremonials of the modern Guebres preserve little or no resemblance to the ancient worship of Persia. See also Hyde, *Rel. Vet. Pers.* p. 574, ed. Oxon. 1760. Our author, last of all, cites the testimonies of Mr Dow and Mr Grose, to establish the same point concerning the religion of the Hindoos; and particularly, to shew that it was "a maxim with the Brahmans, never to defile their sacrifices with blood." The value to be attached to these testimonies may be estimated from what has been already advanced concerning these writers; from the terrific representations of the gods of Hindostan; the cruel austerities with which they were worshipped; and the positive declarations of the most authentic and recent writers on the history of the Hindoos.

Thus, not a single authority of those adduced by Dr Priestley is found to justify his position. But, admitting their fullest application, to what do they amount?—to an instance of relenting hatred in Juno, as described by Virgil; an example of perfect freedom from all apprehension of divine displeasure, in the case of Socrates; and a quotation or two from Mr Dow and Mr Grose, with a prayer from Dr Hyde, to ascertain the religious notions of the Parsis and the Hindoos. These, with a few vague observations on the tenets of certain Atheists of ancient and modern times, (the tendency of which is to shew, that men who did not believe in a moral Governor of the universe, did not fear one,) complete his survey of the religious history of the Heathen world:—and in the conclusion derived from this very copious induction he satisfactorily acquiesces, and boldly defies his opponents to produce a single contradictory instance. (N.B. His abstract of the Jewish testimonies I reserve for a discussion in another place: see No. XXXIII.)

When Dr Priestley thus gravely asserts, that, by this extensive review of facts, he has completely established the position, that natural religion impresses no fears of divine displeasure, and prescribes no satisfaction for offended justice beyond repentance, it seems not difficult to determine how far he relies upon the ignorance of his readers, and upon the force of a bold assertion. As to the position itself, it is clear, that never was an αὐτὸς ἔφα more directly opposed to the voice of history, and to notoriety of fact. Parkhurst, in his

Hebrew Lexicon, on the word אשם, says, "It is known to every one who is acquainted with the mythology of the Heathens, how strongly and generally they retained the tradition of an atonement or expiation for sin." What has been already offered in this Number, may, perhaps, appear sufficient to justify this affirmation. But, indeed, independent of all historical research, a very slight glance at the Greek and Roman classics, especially the poets, the popular divines of the ancients, can leave little doubt upon this head. So clearly does their language announce the notion of a propitiatory atonement, that, if we would avoid an imputation on Dr Priestley's fairness, we are driven of necessity to question the extent of his acquaintance with those writers. Thus, in Homer (*Il.* i. 386) we find the expression *Θεὸν ἱλάσκεσθαι* so used, as necessarily to imply the appeasing the anger of God: and again, (*Il.* ii. 550,) the same expression is employed to denote the propitiation of Minerva by sacrifice, Ἐνθάδε *μιν ταύροισι καὶ ἀρνειοῖς ἱλάονται.* Hesiod, in like manner, (Ἔργ. *καὶ* Ἡμ. 338,) applies the term in such a sense as cannot be misunderstood. Having declared the certainty, that the wicked would be visited by the divine vengeance, he proceeds to recommend sacrifice, as amongst the means of rendering the deity propitious—Ἄλλοτε *δὴ σπονδῇσι θυέεσσί τε ἱλάσκεσθαι.* Plutarch makes use of the word, expressly in reference to the anger of the gods, *ἐξιλάσασθαι τὸ μήνιμα τῆς θεοῦ.* That the words *ἱλάσκεσθαι, ἱλασμὸς,* &c. carry with them the force of rendering propitious an offended deity, might be proved by various other instances from the writers of antiquity; and that, in the use of the terms *ἀποτροπίασμα,* or *ἀποτροπιασμὸς, κάθαρμα, περιψημα,* and *φαρμακὸς,* the ancients meant to convey the idea of a piacular sacrifice averting the anger of the gods, he who is at all conversant with their writings needs not to be informed. The word *περίψημα,* particularly, Hesychius explains by the synonymous terms, *ἀντίλυτρον, ἀντίψυχον*: and Suidas describes its meaning in this remarkable manner—" Οὕτως *ἐπέλεγον,* (Ἀθηναῖοι) *τῷ κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτὸν συνέχοντι πάντων κακά.*" (This Schleusner affirms to be the true reading)—*περίψημα ἡμῶν γενοῦ, ἤτοι σωτηρία καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις.* *Καὶ οὕτως ἐνέβαλλον τῇ θαλάσσῃ, ὡσανεὶ τῷ* Ποσειδῶνι *θυσίαν ἀποτιννύντες.*

Nor is the idea of propitiatory atonement more clearly expressed by the Greek, than it is by the Latin writers of antiquity. The words *placare, propitiare, expiare, litare, placamen, piaculum,* and such like, occur so frequently, and with such clearness of application, that their force cannot be easily misapprehended, or evaded. Thus Horace, (lib. ii. sat. 3,) "Prudens placavi sanguine Divos:" and (lib. i. ode 28,) "Teque piacula nulla resolvent:" and in his second ode, he proposes the question, "cui dabit partes scelus expiandi Jupiter?" ("to which," says Parkhurst, whimsically enough, "the answer in the Poet is, Apollo—the second person in the Heathen Trinity.") Cæsar, likewise, speaking of the Gauls, says, as has been already noticed, "Pro vitâ hominis nisi vita hominis reddatur, non posse deorum immortalium numen placari arbitrantur." Cicero, (*pro Fonteio.* x.) speaking of the same people, says, "Si quando aliquo metu adducti, deos placandos esse arbitrantur, humanis hostiis eorum aras ac templa funestant." The same writer (*De Nat. Deor.* lib. iii. cap. 6) says, "Tu autem etiam Deciorum devotionibus placatos Deos esse censes." From Silius Italicus and Justin, we have the most explicit declarations, that the object of the unnatural sacrifices of the Carthaginians was to obtain pardon from the gods. Thus, the former (lib. iv. lin. 767, &c.)—

> "Mos fuit in populis, quos condidit advena Dido
> Poscere cæde deos veniam, ac flagrantibus aris
> (Infandum dictu) parvos imponere natos"—

And, in like manner, the latter (lib. xviii. cap. 6) expresses himself: "Homines ut victimas immolabant: et impuberes aris admovebant; pacem sanguine eorum exposcentes, pro quorum vitâ dii rogari maxime solent." Lucan also, referring to the same bloody rites, usual in the worship of the cruel gods of the Saxons, thus speaks of them (*Pharsal.* lib. i. lin. 443, &c.)—

> "Et quibus immites placatur sanguine diro
> Teutates, horrensque feris altaribus Hesus,
> Et Tharamis Scythiæ non mitior ara Dianæ."

Virgil likewise, (*Æn.* ii. lin. 116)—

> "Sanguine placastis ventos, et virgine cæsâ,
> Sanguine quærendi reditus, animâque litandum
> Argolicâ"—

Suetonius relates of Otho, (cap. 7) "Per omnia piaculorum genera, manes Galbæ propitiare tentasse." And Livy (lib. vii. cap. 2) says, "Cum vis morbi nec humanis consiliis, nec ope divinâ levaretur, ludi quoque scenici, inter alia cœlestis iræ placamina institui dicuntur:" and the same writer, in another place, directly explains the object of animal sacrifice; "Per dies aliquot, hostiæ majores sine litatione cæsæ, diuque non impetrata pax Deûm." The word *litare* is applied in the same manner by Pliny, (*De Viris Illust. Tull. Host.*) "Dum Numam sacrificiis imitatur, Jovi Elicio litare non potuit; fulmine ictus cum regiâ conflagravit." This sense of the word might be confirmed by numerous instances. Servius (*Æn.* iv. lin. 50) and Macrobius (lib. iii. cap. 5) inform us, that it implies "facto sacrificio placare numen:" and Stephanus says from Nonius, that it differs from *sacrificare* in this, that the signification of the latter is, *veniam* *petere,* but that of the former, *veniam impetrare.*

But to produce all the authorities on this head were endless labour: and, indeed, to have produced so many, might seem to be an useless one, were it not of importance to enable us to appreciate, with exactness, the claims to literary pre-eminence, set up by a writer, who, on all occasions, pronounces *ex cathedrâ;* and on whose dicta, advanced with an authoritative and imposing confidence, and received by his followers with implicit reliance, has been erected a system embracing the most daring impieties that have ever disgraced the name of Christianity. If the observations in this number, of the length of which I am almost ashamed, have the effect of proving to any of his admirers the incompetency of the guide whom they have hitherto followed with unsuspecting acquiescence, I shall so far have served the cause of truth and of Christianity, and shall have less reason to regret the trouble occasioned both to the reader and to myself, by this prolix detail.

No. VI.—Page 9. Col. 2.

ON THE MULTIPLIED OPERATION OF THE DIVINE ACTS.

This thought we find happily conveyed by Mr Pope, in his *Essay on Man:* —

> " In human works, though labour'd on with pain,
> A thousand movements scarce one purpose gain;
> In God's, one single does its end produce;
> Yet serves to second, too, some other use. —— "

In the illustration of this part of my subject, I have been much indebted to the excellent Sermons of the Bishop of London, *On the Christian Doctrine of Redemption;* and also to the sixth Letter of H. Taylor's *Ben Mordecai's Apology* — a work which, though it contains much of what must be pronounced to be erroneous doctrine, is, nevertheless, in such parts as do not take their complexion from the tinge of the author's peculiar opinions, executed with acuteness, learning, and research.

No. VII.—Page 9. Col. 2.

DEISTICAL REASONING INSTANCED IN CHUBB.

The objection stated in the page here referred to, is urged by Chubb, in his reasoning on *Redemption.* The species of argument here employed is a favourite one with this deistical writer. He applies it, on another occasion, to establish a conclusion no less extraordinary, than that the conversion of the Jews or Heathens to Christianity was a matter of little consequence, either as to the favour of God, or their own future safety; "for," adds he, "*if* they were virtuous and good men, they were secure without such conversion; and *if* they were bad vicious men, they were not secured by it!" (*Posthumous Works*, vol. ii. p. 33.) Thus, with the simple apparatus of an *if* and a *dilemma,* was this acute reasoner able, on all occasions, to subvert any part of the system of revelation against which he chose to direct his attacks. The ΔΟΣ ΠΟΥ ΣΤΩ was never wanting to this moral Archimedes; and the fulcrum and two-forked lever were always ready at hand to aid the designs of the logical mechanician.

Yet this man was one of the *enlightened* in his day. And even at the present time, there is good reason to think that he is held in no small estimation by those who claim to be distinguished by that appellation, amongst the professors of Christianity: for, in the treatises of Unitarian and other *philosophic* Christians of these later times, we find the arguments and opinions of this writer plentifully scattered; and at the same time all ostentatious display of the source from which they are derived, most carefully avoided: — circumstances, from which their serious reverence of the author, and the solid value they attach to his works, may reasonably be inferred.

Now, as this writer is one of the oracles from which these illuminating teachers derive their lights, it may afford some satisfaction to the reader, who may not have misemployed time in attempting to wade through the swamp of muddy metaphysics which he has left behind him, to have a short summary of his notions concerning Christianity laid before him.

Having altogether rejected the Jewish revelation, and pronounced the New Testament to be a "fountain of confusion and contradiction," and having, consequently, affirmed every appeal to Scripture to be "a certain way to perplexity and dissatisfaction, but not to find out the truth;" he recommends our return from all these absurdities to "that prior rule of action, that eternal and invariable rule of right and wrong, as to an infallible guide, and as the solid ground of our peace and safety." Accordingly, having himself returned to this infallible guide, he is enabled to make these wonderful discoveries — 1. That there is no particular Providence; and that, consequently, any dependence on Providence, any trust in God, or resignation to his will, can be no part of religion; and, that the idea of application to God for his assistance, or prayer in any view, has no foundation in reason. 2. That we have no reason to pronounce the soul of man to be immaterial, or that it will not perish with the body. 3. That if ever we should suppose a future state in which man shall be accountable, yet the judgment, which shall take place in that state, will extend but to a small part of the human race, and but to a very few of the actions which he may perform—to such alone, for example, as affect the public weal.

Such are the results of argument triumphing over Scripture; and such is the wisdom of man when it opposes itself to the wisdom of God!—Yet this strange and unnatural blasphemer of divine truth declares, that the work, which conveys to the world the monstrous productions of insanity and impiety above cited (and these are but a small portion of the entire of that description,) he had completed in the decline of life, with the design to leave to mankind "a valuable legacy," conducing to their general happiness. The reader will hardly be surprised, after what has been said, to learn, that the same infallible guide which led this maniac to revile the Jewish and Christan Scriptures, and to condemn the apostles and first publishers of Christianity as blunderers and impostors, prompted him at the same time to speak with commendation of the religion of Mahomet.[1] "Whether the Mahometan revelation be of a divine original or not, there seems," says he, "to be a plausible pretence, arising from the circumstances of things, for stamping a divine character upon it!" However, at other times he seems disposed not to elevate the religion of Mahomet decidedly above that of Christ; for he observes, that "the turning from Mahometanism to Christianity, or from Christianity to Mahometanism, is only laying aside one external form of religion and making use of another; which is of no more real benefit than a man's changing the colour of his clothes." His decision upon this point, also, he thinks he can even defend by the authority of St Peter, who, he says, has clearly given it as his opinion, in Acts, x. 34, 35, that all forms of religion are indifferent.

I should not have so long detained my reader with such contemptible, or rather, pitiable, extravagancies, but that the specimen they afford of the wild wanderings of reason, when emancipated from Revelation, may prepare his mind for a juster view of what is called Rational Christianity.

No. VIII.—Page 9. Col. 2.

ON THE CONSISTENCY OF PRAYER WITH THE DIVINE IMMUTABILITY.

See Price's *Dissertations*—2d edit. pp. 209, 210. There are some observations of this excellent and serious writer upon the nature of prayer, which are not only valuable in themselves, but, with some extension, admit so direct a bearing upon the subject before us, that I cannot resist the desire I feel of laying them before the reader. In answer to the objection derived from the unchangeableness of God, and the conclusion thence deduced, that prayer cannot make any alteration in the Deity, or cause him to bestow any blessings which he would not have bestowed without it; this reply is made:—If it be in itself proper, that we should humbly apply to God for the mercies we need from him, it must also be proper, that a regard should be paid to such applications; and that there should be a different treatment of those who make them, and those who do not. To argue this as implying changeableness in the Deity, would be extremely absurd: for the unchangeableness of God, when considered in relation to the exertion of his attributes in the government of the world, consists, not in always acting in the same manner, however cases and circumstances may alter; but in always doing what is right, and in adapting his treatment of his intelligent creatures to the variation of their actions, characters, and dispositions. If prayer, then, makes an alteration in the case of the supplicant, as being the discharge of an indispensable duty; what would in truth infer changeableness in God, would be, not his regarding and answering it, but his not doing this. Hence it is manifest, that the notice which he may be pleased to take of our prayers by granting us blessings in answer to them, is not to be considered as a yielding to importunity, but as an instance of rectitude in suiting his dealings with us to our conduct. Nor does it imply that he is backward to do us good, and therefore wants to be solicited to it; but merely that there are certain conditions, on the performance of which the effects of his goodness to us are suspended; that there is something to be done by us before we can be proper objects of his favour; or before it can be fit and consistent with the measures of the divine government to grant us particular benefits. Accordingly, to the species of objection alluded to in page 9, (namely, that our own worthiness or unworthiness, and the determined will of God, must determine how we are to be treated, absolutely, and so as to render prayer altogether unnecessary,) the answer is obvious, — that before prayer we may be unworthy; and that prayer may be the very thing that makes us worthy: the act of prayer being itself the very condition, the very circumstance in our characters, that contributes to render us the proper objects of divine regard, and the neglect of it being that which disqualifies us for receiving blessings.

---

[1] It deserves to be noticed, that a complacency for the religion of Mahomet is a character by which the liberality of the Socinian or Unitarian is not less distinguished, than that of the Deist. The reason assigned for this by Dr Van Mildert is a just one. Mahometanism is admired by both, because it sets aside those distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel, the divinity of Christ, and the sacrifice upon the cross; and prepares the way for what the latter are pleased to dignify with the title of Natural Religion, and the former with that of Rational Christianity.—Van Mildert's *Boyle Lect.*, vol. i. p. 208. The same writer also truly remarks, (p. 202,) that, besides exhibiting a strange compound of Heathen and Jewish errors, the code of Mahomet comprises almost every heterodox opinion that has ever been entertained respecting the Christain faith.

Indeed, the decided part which the Unitarians have heretofore taken with the prophet of Mecca seems not to be sufficiently adverted to at the present day. The curious reader, if he will turn to Mr Leslie's *Theolog. Works*, vol. i. p. 207., will not be a little entertained to see conveyed, in a solemn address from the English Unitarians to the Mahometan ambassador of Morocco, in the reign of Charles the Second, a cordial approbation of Mahomet and of the Koran. The one is said to have been raised up by God, to scourge the idolizing Christians, whilst the other is spoken of as a precious record of the true faith. Mahomet they represent to be "a preacher of the Gospel of Christ;" and they describe themselves to be "his fellow-champions for the truth." The mode of warfare they admit, indeed, to be different; but the object contended for they assert to be the same. "We, with our Unitarian brethren, have been in all ages exercised, to defend with our pens the faith of one supreme God; as he hath raised your Mahomet to do the same with the sword, as a scourge on those idolizing Christians," (p. 209.) Leslie, upon a full and deliberate view of the case, admits the justice of the claim set up by the Unitarians to be admitted to rank with the followers of Mahomet; pronouncing the one to have as good a title to the appellation of Christians as the other, (p. 337.) On a disclosure, by Mr Leslie, of the attempt which had thus been made by the Socinians, to form a confederacy with the Mahometans, the authenticity of the address, and the plan of the projected coalition, at the time, were strenuously denied. The truth of Mr Leslie's statement, however, (of which from the character of the man no doubt could well have been at any time entertained,) has been since most fully and incontrovertibly confirmed.—See Whitaker's *Origin of Arianism*, p. 399. Mr Leslie also shews, that this Unitarian scheme, of extolling Mahometanism as the only true Christianity, continued, for a length of time, to be acted on with activity and perseverance. He establishes this at large, by extracts from certain of their publications, in which it is endeavoured to prove, "that Mahomet had no other design but to restore the belief of the unity of God, which at that time was extirpated among the Eastern Christians by the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation; that Mahomet meant not, that his religion should be esteemed a new religion, but only the restitution of the true intent of the Christian religion; that the Mahometan learned men call themselves the true disciples of the Messias:"—and, to crown all, "that Mahometanism has prevailed so greatly, not by force and the sword; but by that one truth in the Koran, the Unity of God." And, as a just consequence from all this, it is strongly contended, that "the Tartars had acted more rationally in embracing the sect of Mahomet, than the Christian faith of the Trinity, Incarnation," &c Leslie, vol. i. pp. 216, 217.

Mr Wollaston, in his *Religion of Nature*, (pp. 115, 116,) expresses the same ideas with his usual exact, and (I may here particularly say) mathematical, precision. "The respect, or relation," he observes, "which lies between God, considered as an unchangeable being, and one that is humble, and supplicates, and endeavours to qualify himself for mercy, cannot be the same with that which lies between the same unchangeable God, and one that is obstinate, and will not supplicate,[2] or endeavour to qualify himself: that is, the same thing, or being, cannot respect opposite and contradictory characters in the same manner.[3] It is not, in short, that by our supplication we can pretend to produce any alteration in the Deity, but by an alteration in ourselves we may alter the relation or respect lying between him and us."

The beautiful language of Mrs Barbauld, upon this subject, I cannot prevail upon myself to leave unnoticed. Having observed upon that high toned philosophy, which would pronounce prayer to be the weak effort of an infirm mind to alter the order of nature and the decrees of Providence, in which it rather becomes the wise man to acquiesce with a manly resignation; this elegant writer proceeds to state, that they who cannot boast of such philosophy may plead the example of Him, who prayed, though with meek submission, that the cup of bitterness might pass from him; and who, as the moment of separation approached, interceded for his friends and followers with all the anxiety of affectionate tenderness. But (she adds) we will venture to say, that practically there is no such philosophy. If prayer were not enjoined for the perfection, it would be permitted to the weakness of our nature. We should be betrayed into it, if we thought it sin: and pious ejaculations would escape our lips, though we were obliged to preface them with, God forgive me for praying! — To those (she proceeds) who press the objection, that we cannot see in what manner our prayers can be answered, consistently with the government of the world according to general laws; it may be sufficient to say, that prayer, being made almost an instinct of our nature, it cannot be supposed but that, like all other instincts, it has its use: but that no idea can be less philosophical, than one which implies, that the existence of a God who governs the world, should make no difference in our conduct; and few things less probable, than that the child-like submission which bows to the will of a father, should be exactly similar in feature to the stubborn patience which bends under the yoke of necessity. Remarks on Wakefield's Enquiry, pp. 11—14. See also the excellent remarks of Dr Percival to the same purport, cited in the appendix to this work.

---

[2] *Πῶς ἂν δοίη τῷ πρὸς τὰς ὁρμὰς αὐτεξουσίῳ μὴ αἰτοῦντι ὁ διδόναι πεφυκὼς Θεός;* — Hierocl.

[3] This position he exhibits thus, in language which will be intelligible to mathematicians only. "The ratio of G to $M + q$, is different from that of G to $M - q$: and yet G remains unaltered." To the opponents of the argument this formula of its exposition will no doubt afford ground rather of jocularity than of conviction. For, of men capable of maintaining a contrary opinion, there can be no great hazard in pronouncing, that they are *not* mathematicians.

No. IX.— Page 10. Col. 1.

ON THE GRANTING OF THE DIVINE FORGIVENESS THROUGH A MEDIATOR OR INTERCESSOR.

See H. Taylor's *Ben. Mord.* 5th Letter; in which a number of instances are adduced from the Old Testament, to shew that God's dealing with his creatures is of the nature here described. Thus we find, that, when God had declared that he would destroy the entire nation of Israel, for their idolatry at Horeb (Numb. xiv.), and again, for their intended violence against Caleb and Joshua (Deut. ix.), yet upon the intercession of Moses, he is said to have forgiven them. In like manner, for the sake of ten righteous persons, he would have spared Sodom, (Gen. xviii. 32.) In remembrance of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and for *their sakes*, he is represented as being merciful to their posterity, (Gen. xxvi. 24.) — He forgave Abimelech also upon the prayer of Abraham, (Gen. xx. 7;) and the friends of Job, upon the solicitation of that patriarch, (Job, xlii. 10;) — and what renders these two last instances particularly strong, is, that whilst he declares the purpose of forgiveness, he at the same time expressly *prescribes* the mediation by which it was to be obtained. To quote more of the numerous instances which the Old Testament supplies on this head, must be unnecessary. What has been urged will enable us to form a true judgment of that extraordinary position, on which Dr Priestley relies not a little (*Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 156,) viz. that "the declarations of divine mercy are made without reserve or limitation to the truly penitent, through all the books of Scripture, without the most distant hint of any regard being had to the sufferings or merit of any being whatever."

Very different indeed were the sentiments of the pious writer referred to in the last Number. He not merely admits the contrary of this position to be founded in the facts of revelation; but he maintains the abstract reasonableness of the principle, with a force and feeling, that must render his remarks upon this head particularly acceptable to the reader. "If it be asked," he says, "what influence our prayers can have upon the state of others; what benefit they can derive from our intercessions; or, whether we can conceive that God, like weak men, can be persuaded by the importunity of one person, to bestow upon another blessings which he would not else have bestowed: the proper answer is to be derived from the consideration, that it is by no means necessary to suppose, that the treatment which beings shall receive depends, in all cases, solely on what they are in themselves. This, without doubt, is what the universal Governor chiefly regards; but it is not all. And though there are some benefits of such a nature, that no means can obtain them for beings who have not certain qualifications, there are other benefits which one being may obtain for another, or for which he may be indebted entirely to the kind offices of his fellow-creatures. An advantage may become proper to be granted to another, in consequence of some circumstances he may be in, or some relations in which he may stand to others, which, abstracted from such circumstances and relations, would not have been proper. Nothing more frequently happens in the common course of events.

"The whole scheme of nature seems, indeed, to be contrived on purpose, in such a manner, as that beings might have it in their power, in numberless ways, to bless one another. And one great end of the precarious and mutually dependent condition of men appears plainly to be, that they might have room and scope for the exercise of the beneficent affections. From this constitution of things it is, that almost all our happiness is conveyed to us, not immediately from the hands of God, but by the instrumentality of our fellow-beings, or through them as the channels of his beneficence; in such a sense, that, had it not been for their benevolence and voluntary agency, we should have for ever wanted the blessings we enjoy.

"Now, with respect to prayer, why may not this be one thing that may alter a case, and be a reason with the divine Being for shewing favour? Why, by praying for one another, may we not, as in many other ways, be useful to one another? Why may not the universal Father, in consideration of the humble and benevolent intercessions of some of his children for others, be pleased often, in the course of his providence, to direct events for the advantage of the persons interceded for, in a manner that otherwise would not have been done? — No truly benevolent and pious man can help lifting up his heart to the Deity in behalf of his fellow-creatures. No one whose breast is properly warmed with kind wishes to his brethren about him, and who feels within himself earnest desires to do them all possible good, can avoid offering up his kind wishes and desires to the common Benefactor and Ruler, who knows what is best for every being, and who can make those we love infinitely happy. In reality, supplications to the Deity for our friends and kindred, and all in whose welfare we are concerned, are no less natural than supplications for ourselves. And are they not also reasonable? What is there in them, that is not worthy the most exalted benevolence? May it not be fit, that a wise and good Being should pay a regard to them? And may not the regarding and answering them, and, in general, granting blessings to some on account of the virtue of others, be a proper method of encouraging and honouring virtue, and of rewarding the benevolence of beings to one another? Perhaps, there may not be a better way of encouraging righteousness in the creation, than by making it as much as possible the cause of happiness, not only to the agent himself, but to all connected with him; since there is no virtuous being who would not, in many circumstances, choose to be rewarded with a grant of blessings to his fellow-beings, rather than to himself.

"That our prayers for others may be attended with beneficial effects upon their condition, he considers also to be a prevailing sentiment: otherwise wherefore should we feel ourselves impelled to offer them? Our immediate view in praying must be to obtain what we pray for. This, which is true as applied to prayers on our own behalf, must be also true of our supplications for others. We cannot mean, in addressing to the Deity our desires for others, merely to obtain some benefit to ourselves. And this in itself proves, that the effect of prayer is not merely to be estimated by its tendency to promote our moral and religious improvement."

At the same time, I cannot but lay before the reader the edifying and delightful representation, given by the author, in another place, of the beneficial influence of intercessionary prayer on the mind of him who offers it. "No one can avoid feeling how happy an effect this must have in sweetening our tempers, in reconciling us to all about us, and causing every unfriendly passion to die away within us. We cannot offer up prayers to God for our fellow-men, without setting them before our minds in some of the most engaging lights possible; as partaking of the same nature with ourselves, liable to the same wants and sufferings, and in the same helpless circumstances; as children of the same Father, subjects of the same all-wise government, and heirs of the same hopes. He who prays for others with understanding and sincerity, must see himself on the same level with them; he must be ready to do them all the good in his power; he must be pleased with whatever happiness they enjoy: he can do nothing to lessen their credit or comfort; and fervent desires will naturally rise within him, while thus engaged, that his own breast may be the seat of all those good dispositions and virtues, which he prays that they may be blessed with. Resentment and envy can never be indulged by one, who, whenever he finds himself tempted to them, has recourse to this duty, and sets himself to recommend to the divine favour the persons who excite within him these passions. No desire of retaliation or revenge, nothing of unpeaceableness, ill nature, or haughtiness, can easily shew itself in a heart kept under this guard and discipline. How is it possible to use him ill, for whom we are constant advocates with God? How excellent a parent or friend is he likely to make, who always remembers before God the concerns and interests of his children and friends, in the same manner that he remembers his own? Is there a more rational way of expressing benevolence than this? or a more effectual way of promoting and enlarging it? Nothing is more desirable or more delightful than to feel ourselves continually under the power of kind affections to all about us. Would we be thus happy? Would we have our hearts in a constant state of love and good-will? Would we have every tender sentiment strong and active in our breasts?—Let us be constant and diligent in this part of devotion, and pray continually for others, as we do for ourselves." (Price's *Four Dissertations*, pp. 207, 221—227, 237—239.)

Such was the language of a man, who, whilst (unlike Dr Priestley and his Unitarian associates) he really possessed, and by the habits of his studies daily strengthened, the powers of accurate thinking, had not rationalized away those just and natural sentiments which belong to the truly religious character, and which, whilst the highest exercises of mere intellect cannot reach, its soundest decisions cannot but approve. At the same time, how deeply is it to be deplored, that, in certain of his theological opinions, such a man should have departed widely from the truth of Scripture!

I have willingly permitted myself in this extract to wander beyond what the immediate subject demanded; because, amidst the thorny mazes of polemics, the repose and refreshment which these flowers of genuine piety present would, I apprehended, afford to the reader a satisfaction not less than they had yielded to myself.

No. X.—Page 10. Col. 1.

ON UNITARIANS; OR RATIONAL DISSENTERS.

It is obvious, that the sect, to which I here allude, is that known by the title of Unitarians: a title by which it is meant modestly to insinuate that they are the only worshippers of One God. From a feeling similar to that which has given birth to this denomination, they demand, also, to be distinguished from the other Non-conformists, by the appellation of Rational Dissenters.

Mr Howes has observed, (*Critical Observ.* vol. iv, p. 17.) that the term *Unitarian*, has been used with great vagueness by the very writers who arrogate the name: being applied by some to a great variety of sects, Arians, Ebionites, Theodotians, Sabellians, and Socinians; to any sect, in short, which has pretended to preserve the unity of the Deity, better than the Trinitarians according to the council of Nice: whilst by others, and particularly by Dr Priestley, it is attributed exclusively to those who maintain the mere humanity of Christ. On this account Mr Howes proposed to substitute the word *Humanist*, as more precisely expressing the chief principle of the sect intended: and this word he afterward exchanged for *Humanitarian*, Mr Hobhouse and other Unitarians having adopted that appellation, (*Crit. Obs.* vol. iv. p. 91.) — However, as I find the latest writers of this description prefer the denomination of Unitarian, I have complied with their wishes, in adopting this term throughout the present work; perfectly aware, at the same time, of the impropriety of its appropriation, but being unwilling to differ with them merely about names, where so much attention is demanded by things.

For a full account of the doctrines of this new sect, (for new it must be called, notwithstanding Dr Priestley's laboured, but unsubstantial, examination of "*Early Opinions*,") the reader may consult the *Theological Repository*, the various theological productions of Dr Priestley, and, particularly, Mr Belsham's *Review of Mr Wilberforce's Treatise*. Indeed this last publication presents, on the whole, so extraordinary a system, and conveys so comprehensive a view of all the principles and consequences of the Unitarian scheme, not to be found in any other work of so small a compass, that I think it may not be unacceptable to subjoin to these pages a brief abstract of it, as described by the author. A summary of the tenets of this enlightened sect may furnish matter of speculation, not merely curious but instructive, to those who are not yet tinctured with its principles; and to those who are, it may, perhaps, suggest a salutary warning, by shewing it in all its frightful consequences. Unitarianism, it is true, has not yet made its way into this country in any digested shape; but wherever there are found to prevail a vain confidence in the sufficiency of human reason, and a consequent impatience of authority and control, with a desire to reject received opinions, and to fritter away, by subtle distinctions, plain and established precepts, there the soil is prepared for its reception, and the seed is already sown.

No. XI.—Page 10. Col. 1.

ON THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN UNITARIANS AND SOCINIANS.

The doctrine here stated is that maintained by all the Socinian writers. It may be found so laid down (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i.) in the first article written by Dr Priestley, under the title of *Clemens*. It is, however, to be noted, that Doctor Priestley, his follower Mr Belsham, and others of the same theological opinions, disclaim the title of *Socinian;* and desire to be distinguished by that of *Unitarian*, for the reason assigned in the preceding Number. Mr Belsham goes so far as to say (*Review*, &c. p. 227,) that his "creed is as far removed from that of Socinus, as it is from the peculiar doctrines of Mr Wilberforce." Indeed, to do Socinus justice, it must be admitted that the creed of the Unitarian differs materially from his. He had not reached the acmé of modern illumination. He had not sufficient penetration to discern the various mistakes in the application of Scripture, and the numerous errors in reasoning, committed by the Evangelists and Apostles, which have been detected and dragged to light by the sagacious Unitarian. He had not discovered that Christ was the human offspring of Joseph and Mary. He had not divested our Lord of his regal, as well as his sacerdotal character, and reduced him to the condition of a mere prophet. He had weakly imagined, that, by virtue of his regal office, Christ possessed the power of delivering his people from the punishment of their sins. But Doctor Priestley has rectified this error. In his *Hist. of Cor.* (vol. i. p. 272) he expressly points out the difference between himself and Socinus, on this head. "It immediately follows," he says, "from his (Socinus's) principles, that Christ being only a man, though ever so innocent, his death could not, in any proper sense of the word, atone for the sins of other men. He was, however, far from abandoning the doctrine of Redemption, in the Scripture sense of the word, that is, of our deliverance from the guilt of sin, by his Gospel, as promoting repentance and reformation; and from the punishment due to sin, by his power of giving eternal life to all that obey him.—But, indeed, if God himself freely forgives the sins of men, upon repentance, there could be no occasion, properly speaking, for any thing farther being done to avert the punishment with which they had been threatened."

This passage, whilst it marks the distinction between the Socinian and the Unitarian, fully opens up the scheme of the latter. But, on this system, it may be curious to inquire in what light the death of our blessed Lord is represented. Dr Priestley (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 39) gives us this information:—"Christ being a man, who suffered and died in the best of causes, there is nothing so very different in the occasion and manner of his death from that of others who suffered and died after him in the same cause of Christianity, but that their sufferings and death may be considered in the same light with his." This extraordinary assertion exactly agrees with what is recorded of Solomon Eccles, a great preacher and prophet of the Quakers; who expressly declares, "that the blood of Christ was no more than the blood of any other saint," (Leslie's *Works*, fol. vol. ii. p. 195.) — Thus strangely do the philosophy of Doctor Priestley, and the fanaticism of the Quaker, concur with that which both would pronounce to be the gross absurdity of Popery. For, if the death of Christ be viewed in the same light with the death of any other martyr, the invocation of the popish saints may appear a consequence not so revolting to Christian piety. That the lines of error, in their manifold directions, should sometimes intersect, if not for a certain length of way coincide, is not however matter of surprise.

But the death of Christ being treated in this manner by Doctor Priestley and his Unitarian followers, one is naturally led to inquire what their notions are of his state subsequent to his resurrection. Mr Belsham (*Review*, &c. p. 74) gives us satisfaction on this head. The Unitarians, he says, here entirely differ from the Socinians : for that the latter hold the "unscriptural and most incredible notion, that, since his resurrection, he has been advanced to the government of the universe : but a consistent Unitarian, acknowledging Jesus as a man in all respects like to his brethren, regards his kingdom as entirely of a spiritual nature." We are not, however, to suppose our blessed Lord altogether banished from existence ; for this gentleman admits again, (p. 85) that he is "now alive" somewhere, "and without doubt employed in offices the most honourable and benevolent ;" — in such, of course, as any of his *brother-men*, to whom he is above described as in all respects similar, might be engaged. On this, and other such wild blasphemies of this sect, as represented by Mr Belsham, see the Appendix.

No. XII.—Page 10. Col. 2.

ON THE CORRUPTION OF MAN'S NATURAL STATE.

They who may wish to see this subject extensively treated, will find it amply discussed in Leland's work on the *Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation*. In Mr Wilberforce's *Practical View*, also, we meet with a description of the state of unassisted nature, distinguished not less, unhappily, by its truth, than by its eloquence.

After a forcible enumeration of the gross vices into which the heathen world, both ancient and modern, had been sunk ; and this not only amongst the illiterate and the vulgar, but also amongst the learned and the refined, even to the decent Virgil and the philosophic Cicero ; he proceeds, in the following animated tone, to examine the state of morals among those who have been visited by the lights of the Gospel :—

"But you give up the heathen nations as indefensible ; and wish rather to form your estimate of man, from a view of countries which have been blessed with the light of revelation. True it is, and with joy let us record the concession, Christianity has set the general tone of morals much higher than it was ever found in the pagan world. She has every where improved the character, and multiplied the comforts of society ; particularly to the poor and the weak, whom, from the beginning, she professed to take under her special patronage. Like her divine Author, 'who sends his rain on the evil and on the good,' she showers down unnumbered blessings on thousands who profit from her bounty, while they forget or deny her power, and set at nought her authority. Yet, even in this more favoured situation, we shall discover too many lamentable proofs of the depravity of man. Nay, this depravity will now become even more apparent and less deniable. For what bars does it not now overleap ? over what motives is it not now victorious ? Consider well the superior light and advantages which we enjoy, and then appreciate the superior obligations which are imposed on us. Consider well," &c.

"Yet, in spite of all our knowledge, thus powerfully enforced and pressed home upon us, how little has been our progress in virtue! It has been by no means such as to prevent the adoption, in our days, of various maxims of antiquity, which, when well considered, too clearly establish the depravity of man." Having adduced several instances in proof of this assertion, he thus proceeds :—"But surely, to any who call themselves Christians, it may be justly urged as an astonishing instance of human depravity, that we ourselves, who enjoy the full light of revelation,—to whom God has vouchsafed such clear discoveries of what it concerns us to know of his being and attributes ; who profess to believe that in him we live, and move, and have our being ; that to him we owe all the comforts we here enjoy, and the offer of eternal glory purchased for us by the atoning blood of his own Son ; that we, thus loaded with mercies, should every one of us be continually chargeable with forgetting his authority, and being ungrateful for his benefits ; with slighting his gracious proposals, or receiving them, at best, but heartlessly and coldly."

"But to put the question concerning the natural depravity of man to the severest test,—Take the best of the human species, the watchful, diligent, self-denying Christian, and let him decide the controversy ; and that, not by inferences drawn from the practices of a thoughtless and dissolute world, but by an appeal to his personal experience. Go with him into his closet, ask him his opinion of the corruption of his heart ; and he will tell you, that he is deeply sensible of its power, for that he has learned it from much self-observation, and long acquaintance with the workings of his own mind. He will tell you, that every day strengthens this conviction; yea, that hourly he sees fresh reason to deplore his want of simplicity in intention, his infirmity of purpose, his low views, his selfish, unworthy desires, his backwardness to set about his duty, his languor and coldness in performing it: that he finds himself obliged continually to confess, that he feels within him two opposite principles, and that he cannot do the things that he would. He cries out in the language of the excellent Hooker, 'The little fruit which we have in holiness, it is, God knoweth, corrupt and unsound: we put no confidence at all in it, we challenge nothing in the world for it, we dare not call God to reckoning, as if we had him in our debt books; our continual suit to him is, and must be, to bear with our infirmities, and pardon our offences!'" (Wilberforce's *Practical View*, pp. 28—37.)

Such is the view which a pious and impressive writer has given of what all, who reflect, must acknowledge to be the true condition of man. Another writer, not less pious and impressive (Mrs Hannah More,) has, with her usual powers of eloquence, presented the same picture of the moral and religious history of the world, in her admirable *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education.* To observations similar to those of Mr Wilberforce, on the doctrine of human depravity, she adds this remark:—"Perhaps one reason why the faults of the most eminent saints are recorded in Scripture, is, to add fresh confirmation to this doctrine. If Abraham, Moses, Noah, Elijah, David, and Peter, sinned, who, shall we presume to say, has escaped the universal taint?" (H. More's *Works*, iv. 330, 331.)

How easily is this question answered by the follower of Priestley,—or I may add, (strange as the combination may appear,) of Wesley! The former produces his philosopher, the latter his saint, in refutation of such unworthy and disparaging notions of human nature. They differ, indeed, in one material point. The one contends, that by his own virtuous resolutions he can extricate himself from vicious propensities and habits: whilst the other is proud to admit, that the divine favour has been peculiarly exerted in his behalf, to rescue him from his sins. The one denies that he was ever subject to an innate depravity; the other confesses that he was, boasts even of its inveteracy, but glories that he has been perfectly purified from its stains. But both are found to agree, most exactly, in that vain self-complacency, which exults in the reflection that they "are not as other[4] men are;" and in the arrogant presumption, that they are lifted above that corruption of nature from which the more humble and more deserving Christian feels himself not to be exempt. In the *philosophizing* Christian all this is natural and consistent. But in the Methodist, (I speak of the Arminian Methodist, or follower of Wesley,) it is altogether at variance with the doctrines which he professes to maintain. Accuracy of reasoning, however, is not among the distinctive marks of this latter description of religionists. A warm fancy, with a weak intellect; strong passions and vehement conceit, almost always go to the composition of the character. That such qualities should find many minds of congenial aptitude, is a thing not to be wondered at. And therefore, that this mixture of fanaticism, hypocrisy, vanity, and ignorance, should be widely spreading in both countries, is perfectly natural.

It is, however, to be lamented, that such a mischievous corruption of true religion should receive countenance from any of its real friends, and it is a matter equally of surprise and concern, that a system, which no longer covertly, but openly and avowedly, works in continued hostility to the established religion, has not met with more effectual resistance from those who may be supposed to take an interest in the well-being of the Establishment. On the contrary, examples are not wanting of cases, in which the clergy have been set aside in the work of religious instruction; whilst men, who uphold the Wesleyan chimera of perfection, who openly reject the Liturgy[5] and Articles, and oppose the doctrines of the Established Church, have been deemed fit objects of preference to the recognized religious teachers of the land.

---

[4] The contemptuous language which the overweening Methodist is too apt to employ, with respect to all who are not within his sanctified pale, but more especially with respect to the clergy of the Establishment, affords but too strong a justification of this charge as it applies to him. The clergy are uniformly, with religionists of this description, "dumb dogs," "watchmen who sleep upon their posts," "priests of Baal," "wolves in sheep's clothing," &c. &c. Indeed, Mr Whitefield informs us in his *Works* (vol. iv. p. 67,) that "Mr Wesley thought meanly of Abraham, and, he believes, of David also:" whilst of Mr Wesley himself we are told, that "wherever he went, he was received as an apostle;" and that "in the honour due to Moses he also had a share, being placed at the head of a great people by Him who called them," &c. (Hampson's *Life of Wesley*, vol. iii. p. 35. Coke's *Life of Wesley*, p. 520.)—Mr Wesley has taken care to let mankind know, that Methodism "is the only religion worthy of God" (Hamps. vol. iii. p. 30;) and the miracles which repeatedly attested his divine mission for the propagation of this religion he has most copiously recorded throughout his Journals.—Whoever wishes to form a just idea of the pernicious extravagances of this arch enthusiast, and of his followers, will find ample satisfaction in Bishop Lavington's *Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists compared*, (a book, which B. Warburton, in one of his private letters to his friend Hurd, very unfairly describes, as "a bad copy of Stillingfleet's famous book of the *Fanaticism of the Church of Rome*,") and in the later publication of Nott's *Religious Enthusiasm considered.*

[5] The treatment which the Liturgy and the Articles have experienced from Mr Wesley, is, I apprehend, very little understood by the generality of those who are disposed to look with complacency upon the sect of which he has been the founder. Professing to adopt the Liturgy of the Church of England, he has framed one for his followers, differing from it in many and

Against abuses such as these, and particularly against the open outrages upon decency and upon the rights of the Establishment, of which many of this wild and fantastic sect have been guilty, I am happy to say that some respectable members of the National Church have lifted their voices in both countries. Amongst these I allude with particular pleasure to my respected friend and brother academic, Dr Hales; and I allude to him the more willingly, not only because he has with much ability and good temper combated and confuted the extravagent dogmas of sinless perfection, and miraculous impulses, which are the distinguishing tenets of this sect; but because he has, in opposition to their wild rhapsodies, exhibited such a portrait of the true Christian, and of the nature of that perfection which it is permitted him in this life to attain, as is strictly warranted by Scripture, and highly edifying to contemplate. I, therefore, here subjoin it, both as being naturally connected with the present subject, and as being calculated to afford satisfaction and improvement to the Christian reader.

"The perfect Christian, according to the representation of Holy Writ, is he who, as far as the infirmity of his nature will allow, aspires to universal holiness of life; uniformly and habitually endeavouring to 'stand perfect and complete in all the will of God,' and to 'fulfil all righteousness,' in humble imitation of his Redeemer; who daily and fervently prays for 'increase of faith,' like the Apostles themselves; and strenuously labours to 'add to his faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity.' Such is the assemblage of virtues necessary to constitute the character of the perfect Christian; ever aiming at, though never attaining to, absolute or sinless perfection, in this present state of trial, probation, and preparation for a better; and meekly resting all his hopes of favour and acceptance with God, not on his own defective and imperfect righteousness, but on 'the free grace of God, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus;' 'for by grace we are saved through faith, and this not of ourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, that no one should boast.' "—*Methodism Inspected*, pp. 30, 31.—This is the language of reason and of Scripture,[6] by which the Christian, though ever aspiring to a higher and a better nature, is still reminded of that nature which belongs to him, and against the infirmities of which he can never either relax in vigilance, or remit in exertion.

How strongly contrasted with such language are the above dogmas alluded to and the authorities adduced in their support! That the nature of those dogmas, and the extent to which they are maintained, may be the better understood, I must here detain the reader with a few passages from the writings of Mr Wesley. As possessing the advantages of education, talents, and knowledge of mankind, in a degree which places him much above the level of those who have succeeded him in the Methodist ministry, he may well

---

essential particulars. He confesses, indeed, that he has made some slight alterations; which he enumerates in such a way as would naturally induce the supposition, that the difference is altogether unimportant: whilst, in truth, he has not only newly modified the Common Prayer, and nearly abolished the whole of the baptismal office; but, besides mutilating above sixty of the Psalms, has discarded thirty-four others, and newly rendered many of the remainder. Of the Psalms which he has discarded, six, at least, are admitted to be eminently prophetic of our Saviour, of his incarnation, his sufferings, and his ascension; whilst the reason assigned for the expurgation is, their being "improper for the mouth of a Christian congregation!" But this is not all: the Rubrick and the appointed Lessons are in most places altered; and the Catechism, and the two Creeds (the Nicene and Athanasian) totally discarded. Of these last-mentioned alterations, it is also particularly to be obseved, that Mr Wesley gave to his followers no notice whatever; whilst the former were represented by him as of a nature altogether unimportant: so that the ignorant amongst his adherents were led to imagine that they were not materially departing from the forms of the Establishment: when, in truth, they were altogether drawn away from the offices of the Church.—To complete the whole, Mr Wesley provided his Communion also with a new set of Articles; reducing the number from thirty-nine to twenty-five, and making such changes in those which he retained as he found most convenient.

Not to dwell too long upon this subject, suffice it to adduce two instances of omitted Articles; from which the spirit that governed the whole may easily be divined. The eighteenth Article, which pronounces, that "Eternal salvation is to be obtained only by the name of Christ;" and the fifteenth, which asserts, "that Christ alone was without sin," are two of those, which the founder of Methodism has declared to be unfit objects of a Christian's belief. Thus it appears that the Socinian is not the only sectary that would degrade the dignity of Christ.—Such are the people from whom certain weak members of the Establishment apprehend no mischief.—On the points which have been here noticed, see particularly Nott's *Relig. Enth.* pp. 150—167.

It may be satisfactory to the reader to know exactly what are the Articles and Psalms that have been rejected by Mr Wesley.—The Articles rejected are, the third, eighth, the greater part of the *ninth*, thirteenth, *fifteenth*, seventeenth, *eighteenth*, twentieth, twenty-first, *twenty-third*, twenty-sixth, much of the twenty-seventh, *twenty-ninth*, thirty-third, and three others of the less important ones at the end. Those marked in italics are more particularly to be noticed. The Psalms rejected are, the 14th, 21st, 52d, 53d, 54th, 58th, 60th, 64th, 72d, 74th, 78th—83d, 87th, 88th, 94th, 101st, 105th, 106th, 108th—110th, 120th, 122d, 129th, 132d, 134th, 136th, 137th, 140th, 149th. The general character of the rejected Articles and Psalms will pretty clearly establish what has been alleged as to the nature of the opinions which Mr Wesley and his followers maintain, or, at least, of the doctrines which they reject.

[6] Dr Stack also uses a language of like sobriety and scriptural correctness, in those passages of his very useful Lectures on the *Acts*, and *on the Romans*, in which he has occasion to speak of the influence of the Holy Spirit. See particularly pp. 35. 36. of the former work, and pp. 148—150. of the latter. Attend also to the excellent observations of Dr Tomline, on the degree of purity attainable by the Christian, and the nature of the endeavours which he is to make after perfection.—*Elem. of Christ.* Theol. vol. ii. p. 285.

be supposed not to have propounded the opinions of the sect in a shape more extravagant than that in which they are embraced by his followers. And first, on the subject of miraculous manifestations and impulses in the forgiveness of sins and assurance of salvation, he tells us: "God does now, as aforetime, give remissions of sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost to us; and that always suddenly, as far as I have known, and often in dreams, and in the visions of God," (Hampson's *Life of Wesley*, ii. 81.)—Again: "I am one of many witnesses of this matter of fact, that God does now make good this his promise daily, very frequently during a representation (how made I know not, but not to the outward eye) of Christ, either hanging on the cross, or standing on the right hand of God," (Hamps. ii. 55.)—Again: "I saw the fountain opened in his side — we have often seen Jesus Christ crucified, and evidently set forth before us," (B. Lavingt. vol. i. part i. p. 51.)—And Coke, in his *Life of Wesley*, says, that "being in the utmost agony of mind, there was clearly represented to him Jesus Christ pleading for him with God the Father, and gaining a free pardon for him." Secondly, as to the tenet of perfection, Mr Wesley affords us the following ample explanation:—"They (the purified in heart) are freed from self-will: as desiring nothing, no not for a moment, but the holy and perfect will of God: neither supplies in want, nor ease in pain, nor life, nor death, but continually cry in their inmost soul, 'Father, thy will be done.'" "They are freed from evil thoughts,[7] so that they cannot enter into them, no not for an instant. Aforetime, (*i. e.* when only justified) when an evil thought came in, they looked up, and it vanished away: but now it does not come in; there being no room for this in a soul, which is full of God. They are freed from wanderings in prayer: they have an unction from the Holy One, which abideth in them, and teacheth them every hour what they shall do, and what they shall speak."—(Pref. to second volume of Wesley's *Hymns*, Hamps. iii. 52; and Coke's *Life of Wes.* pp. 278, 344.)

These extracts from the writings of the father of Methodism fairly open up to us the two great fundamental doctrines of the sect: viz. 1. That the assurances of forgiveness and of salvation arise from a sudden infusion of divine feeling, conveyed by some sensible and miraculous manifestation of the Spirit: and 2. That the true believer attains in this life such perfection, as to be altogether free from sin, and even from the possibility of sin. Holding such doctrines, it is not at all wonderful that the Wesleyan Methodist is indifferent about every other. Mr Wesley fairly says upon the subject of doctrines, "I will not quarrel with you about any opinions: believe them true or false!" (*Third Appeal*, p. 185.) In another place he confesses, "The points we chiefly insisted upon were, that Orthodoxy, or Right Opinions, is at best a very slender part of religion,[8] if it can be allowed to be any part of it at all!" This, it must be admitted, is an excellent expedient for adding to the numbers of the sect. A perfect indifference about doctrines, and a strong persuasion that the divine favour is secured, whilst the fancy of each individual is counted to him for faith, — are such recommendations of any form of religion, as can scarcely be resisted. But what can be more mischievous than all this? What more destructive of true religion? The sound principles of Christian doctrine disparaged as of no value to the believer; and the serious feelings of Christian piety caricatured, and thereby brought into general disrepute; whilst the sober and regulated teaching of the national clergy is treated with contumely and contempt; and separation from the national church deemed a decisive criterion of godly sincerity!— In the contemplation of such a state of things, it seems as if one were surveying the completion of the following prospective description given to us by Sir Walter Raleigh:—"When all order, discipline, and church government shall be left to newness of opinion, and men's fancies; soon after, as many kinds of religion will spring up as there are parish churches within England: every contentious and ignorant person clothing his fancy with the Spirit of God, and his imagination with the gift of revelation: insomuch as when the Truth, which is but *one*, shall appear to the simple multitude no less variable than contrary to itself, the faith of men will soon after die away by degrees, and all religion be held in scorn and contempt."—*Hist. of the World*, b. ii. ch. v. sect. 1.

---

[7] That he, who could use such language as this, would feel it necessary to reject the fifteenth Article of the Church, as the reader is already apprised Mr Wesley did, will not appear surprising on a perusal of that article. — "Christ, in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh and in his spirit. He came to be a lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world: and sin, as St John saith, was not in him. But all we the rest, although baptized and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." Such is the doctrine of the Established Church; and such is the direct contrary of the doctrine which Mr Wesley and his followers hold upon the subject of this Article; for which reason they have, with perfect consistency, rejected it from their code of Christian belief. And, for the same reason, the cry of the party is every where loudly raised against every work that intimates the corruption of man's nature, in the language of the Article.

As to the rejection of the eighteenth Article, Mr Wesley's language has not been so explicit as to enable us to pronounce, with perfect certainty, upon the precise ground of that rejection. But when we consider, that in that Article there is contained a condemnation of the assertion "that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth;" and that it is at the same time affirmed, that "Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved;" and when at the same time we recollect, that "the name of Jesus Christ" implies certain belief and doctrines respecting the nature of the Saviour and the religion which he has taught; whilst Mr Wesley considers doctrines, or right opinions, to be of little value, and holds the religious feelings which distinguish the true Methodist to be the only sure pledge and passport of salvation:— when we compare these things together, we seem to run no great risk in concluding, that this article was condemned by the founder of Methodism, as clearly marking, that religious opinions were by no means a matter of indifference; that, on the contrary, just notions concerning Christ were requisite for salvation; and that for the want of these, no association with any particular sect or religious description whatever could make compensation.

[8] On this favourite position of Mr Wesley, Bishop Warburton justly remarks, that here is a complete separation between reason and religion. For when reason is no longer employed to distinguish right from wrong opinions, religion has no farther connection with it. But, reason once separated from religion, must not piety degenerate either into nonsense or madness? And for the fruits of grace what can remain but the froth and dregs of enthusiasm and superstition? In the first ages of Christianity,

No. XIII.—Page 11. Col. 1.

ON THE MISREPRESENTATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT BY UNITARIANS.

On this subject Dr Priestley (*Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 153) thus represents the arguments of the Orthodox. "Sin, being an offence against an infinite Being, requires an infinite satisfaction, which can only be made by an infinite person; that is, one who is no less than God himself. Christ, therefore, in order to make this infinite satisfaction for the sins of men, must himself be God, equal to God the Father." With what candour this has been selected, as a specimen of the mode of reasoning by which the doctrine of Atonement, as connected with that of the divinity of Christ, is maintained by the Established Church, it is needless to remark. That some few, indeed, have thus argued, is certainly to be admitted and lamented. But how poorly such men have reasoned, it needed not the acuteness of Dr Priestley to discover. On their own principle, the reply is obvious, — that sin being *committed by* a finite creature, requires only a finite satisfaction, for which purpose a finite person might be an adequate victim. But the insinuation, that our belief in the divinity of Christ has been the offspring of this strange conceit, is much more becoming the determined advocate of a favourite cause, than the sober inquirer after truth. Our mode of reasoning is directly the reverse. The Scriptures proclaim the divinity of Christ; and so far are we from inferring this attribute of our Lord from the necessity of an infinite satisfaction, that we infer, from it, both the great love of our Almighty Father, who has "spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all;" and the great heinousness of human guilt, for the expiation of which it was deemed fit that so great a Being should suffer. The decent manner in which Mr Belsham has thought proper to represent the orthodox notion of the Atonement, is, that man could "not have been saved, unless one God had died, to satisfy the justice, and appease the wrath of another" (*Review*, &c. p. 221.) This is language with which I should not have disgraced my page, but that it may serve to shew how dangerous a thing it is to open a door to opinions, that can admit of treating subjects the most sacred with a levity which seems so nearly allied to impiety.

No XIV.—Page 11. Col. 1.

ON THE DISRESPECT OF SCRIPTURE MANIFESTED BY UNITARIAN WRITERS.

Perhaps I may be charged with having made a distinction in this place, which gives an unfair representation of Unitarians, inasmuch as they also profess to derive their arguments from Scripture. But whether that profession be not intended in mockery, one might be almost tempted to question, when it is found, that, in every instance, the doctrine of Scripture is tried by their abstract notion of right, and rejected if not accordant; — when, by means of figure and allusion, it is every where made to speak a language the most repugnant to all fair critical interpretation; until, emptied of its true meaning, it is converted into a vehicle for every fantastic theory, which, under the name of rational, they may think proper to adopt; — when, in such parts as propound Gospel truths of a contexture too solid to admit of an escape in figure and allusion, the sacred writers are charged as bunglers, pro-

---

the glory of the Gospel consisted in its being a *reasonable service*. By this it was distinguished from the several modes of Gentile religion, the essence of which consisted in fanatic raptures and superstitious ceremonies; without any articles of belief or formula of faith; "right opinion being," on the principles of the Pagan priesthood, "at best, but a very slender part of religion, if any part of it at all." But Christianity arose on different principles. St Paul considers right opinion as one full third part of religion, where, speaking of the three great fundamental principles on which the Christian Church is erected, he makes truth to be one of them:—"The fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, righteousness, and truth." So different was St Paul's idea, from that entertained of Christianity by Mr Wesley, who comprises all in the new birth, and makes believing to consist entirely in feeling. On the whole, therefore, we may fairly conclude (with Warburton,) that that wisdom which divests Christianity of truth and reason, and resolves its essence rather into mental and spiritual sensations, than tries it by moral demonstration, can never be the wisdom which is from above, whose first characteristic attribute is purity. The same writer truly adds, that if Mr Wesley's position be well founded, the first Reformers of Religion from the errors of Popery have much to answer for: who, for the sake of "right opinion, at best a slender part of religion, if any part of it at all," occasioned so much turmoil, and so many revolutions in civil as well as in religious systems.—See Warburton's *Principles of Nat. and Rev. Religion*, vol. i. pp. 263—267.

ducing "lame accounts, improper quotations, and inconclusive reasonings," (Dr Priestley's 12th *Letter to Mr Burn,*) and philosophy is consequently called in to rectify their errors; —when one writer of this class (Steinbart) tells us, that "the narrations" (in the New Testament) "true or false, are only suited for ignorant, uncultivated minds, who cannot enter into the evidence of natural religion;" and again, that "Moses, according to the childish conceptions of the Jews in his days, paints God as agitated by violent affections, partial to one people, and hating all other nations;" — when another (Semler,) remarking on St Peter's declaration, that "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit," says, that "Peter speaks here according to the conception of the Jews," and that, "the prophets may have delivered the offspring of their own brains as divine revelations," (Dr Erskine's *Sketches and Hints of Ch. Hist.* No. 3, pp. 66, 71); — when a third (Engedin) speaks of Saint John's portion of the New Testament, as written with "concise and abrupt obscurity, inconsistent with itself, and made up of allegories;" and Gagneius glories in having given "a little light to Saint Paul's darkness, a darkness, as some think, industriously affected;" — when we find Mr Evanson, one of those able commentators referred to by Mr Belsham in his *Review*, &c. p. 206, assert, (*Dissonance*, &c. p. 1) that "the evangelical histories contain gross and irreconcileable contradictions," and consequently discard three out of the four, retaining the Gospel of St Luke only; at the same time drawing his pen over as much of this, as, either from its infelicity of style, or other such causes, happens not to meet his approbation;—when we find Dr Priestley, besides his charge against the writers of the New Testament before recited, represent, in his *Letter to Dr Price*, the narration of Moses concerning the creation and the fall of man, as a lame account; and thereby meriting the praise of "magnanimity," bestowed on him by theologians equally enlightened; — when, finally, not to accumulate instances where so many challenge attention, we find the Gospel openly described by Mr Belsham, (*Review*, &c. p. 217,) as containing nothing more than the Deism of the French Theo-Philanthrope, save only the fact of the resurrection of a human being (see Appendix;) and when, for the purpose of establishing this, he engages, that the Unitarian writers shall prune down the Scriptures to this moral system and this single fact, by shewing that whatever supports any thing else is either "interpolation, omission, false reading, mistranslation, or erroneous interpretation" (*Review*, pp. 206, 217, 272;) — when, I say, all these things are considered, and when we find the Bible thus contemned and rejected by the gentlemen of this new light, and a new and more convenient Gospel carved out for themselves, can the occasional profession of reverence[9] for Scripture, as the word of God, be treated in any other light, than as a convenient mask, or an insulting sneer?

It might be a matter of more than curious speculation, to frame a Bible according to the modifications of the Unitarian commentators. The world would then see, after all the due amputations and amendments, to what their respect for the sacred text amounts. Indeed it is somewhat strange, that men so zealous to enlighten and improve the world have not, long before this, blessed it with so vast a treasure. Can it be, that they think the execution of such a work would impair their claim to the name of Christians? Or is it rather, that even the Bible, so formed, must soon yield to another more perfect, as the still increasing flood of light pours in new knowledge? That the latter is the true cause, may perhaps be inferred, as well from the known magnanimity of those writers, which cannot be supposed to have stooped to the former consideration, as from Dr Priestley's own declarations. In his *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever*, (part ii. pp. 33—35.) he informs us, that he was once "a Calvinist, and that of the straitest sect." Afterwards, he adds, he "became a high Arian; next a low Arian, and then a Socinian; and in a little time a Socinian of the lowest kind, in which Christ is considered as a mere man, the son of Joseph and Mary, and naturally as fallible and peccable as Moses, or any other prophet." And, after all, he tells us, (*Def. of Unit.* for 1787, p. 111.) that he "does not know when his creed will be fixed." Mr Belsham having set out and ended at the same point with Dr Priestley, it is not improbable that he has gone through the same revolution: and that he, and others who have enjoyed the same progressive illumination, would, equally with Dr Priestley, still contend for the freedom of an unsettled creed, is not perhaps too violent a presumption. Now, as every step in such an indefinite progress, must induce a corresponding change of canon, it is not wonderful that they whose creed is in a perpetual state of variation, and whose Bible must be, like their almanack, suited only to a particular season, should not have attempted any fixed standard[10] of the Sacred Word.

---

[9] The fathers of the Socinian School are as widely distinguished from their followers of the present day, by their modesty and moderation, as by their learning and their talents. Yet, that it may be the more plainly discerned how remote the spirit of Socinianism has been, at all times, from the reverence due to the authority of Scripture, I here subjoin, in the words of two of their early writers, specimens of the treatment which the sacred volume commonly receives at their hand. Faustus Socinus, after pronouncing with sufficient decision against the received doctrine of the Atonement, proceeds to say, "Ego quidem, *etiamsi non semel, sed sæpe id in sacris monimentis scriptum extaret;* non idcirco tamen ita rem prorsus se habere crederem." Socin. *Opera*, tom. ii. p. 204. — And with like determination, Smalcius affirms of the Incarnation; "Credimus, *etiamsi non semel atque iterum, sed satis crebro et dissertissime scriptum extaret* Deum esse hominem factum, multo satius esse, quia hæc res sit absurda, et sanæ rationi plane contraria, et in Deum blasphema, *modum aliquem dicendi comminisci*, quo ista de Deo dici possint, *quam ista simpliciter ita ut verba sonant intelligere.*" (*Homil.* viii. ad cap. 1. Joh.) — Thus it appears from these instances, joined to those which have been adduced above, to those which have been noticed at the end of No. I. and to others of the like nature, which might be multiplied from writers of the Socinian School without end; that the most explicit, and precise, and emphatical language, announcing the doctrines which the philosophy of that school condemns, would, to its disciples, be words of no meaning; and the Scripture, which adopted such language, but an idle fable. *Non persuadebis etiamsi persuaseris*, is the true motto of the Unitarian. And the reader, I trust, will not think that I have drawn too strong conclusions upon this subject at the close of the first Number, when he finds the proof of what is there advanced strengthening so powerfully as we proceed.

No. XV.—Page 11. Col. 2.

ON THE HEATHEN NOTIONS OF MERIT ENTERTAINED BY UNITARIAN WRITERS.

A writer, whom I cannot name but with respect,—to the beauties of whose composition no one, that possesses taste or feeling, can be insensible,—speaking of Dr Price, in her captivating defence of public worship against Mr Wakefield (to which publication I have already referred the reader in a preceding Number,) uses this extraordinary language:—"When a man like Dr Price is about to resign his soul into the hands of his Maker, he ought to do it not only with a reliance on his mercy, but his *justice*," (Mrs Barbauld's *Remarks on Mr Wakefield's Enquiry*, p. 72.) In the same style do Unitarian writers, in general, express themselves on this subject, representing good works as giving a claim of right to the divine acceptance.

Indeed, the manner in which some Socinians, of the new school, speak of their virtues, their merits, and their title to the rewards of a happy immortality, is such as might lead us to suppose ourselves carried back to the days of the old heathen schools of the Stoics, and receiving lessons, not from the followers of the humble Jesus, but from the disciples of the arrogant and magniloquent Chrysippus, Seneca, or Epictetus. When Chrysippus tells us, that, "as it is proper for Jupiter to glory in himself, and in his own life, and to think and speak magnificently of himself, as living in a manner that deserves to be highly spoken of; so these things are becoming all good men, as being in nothing exceeded by Jupiter," (Plut. *De Stoic. Repugn. Oper.* tom. ii. p. 1038. ed. Xyl.:) when Seneca pronounces, that "a good man differs only in time from God," (*De Provid.* cap. 1.;) that "there is one thing, in which the wise man excels God, that God is wise by the benefit of nature, not by his own choice," (*Epist.* 53.;) and that "it is shameful to importune the Gods in prayer, since a man's happiness is entirely in his own power," (*Epist.* 31.:) and when Epictetus, (*Disc.* lib. iv. cap. 10.) represents the dying man making his address to God, in a strain of self-confidence, without the least acknowledgment of any one failure or neglect of duty; so that, as Miss Carter with a becoming piety remarks, it is such an address, "as cannot, without shocking arrogance, be uttered by any one born to die;" when, I say, we hear such language from the ancient Stoic, what do we hear, but the sentiments of the philosophising Christian of the present day? and, on casting an eye into the works of Priestley, Lindsey, Evanson, Wakefield, Belsham, and the other Unitarian writers, do we not instantly recognize that proud, and independent, and, I had almost said, heaven-defying self-reliance, which had once distinguished the haughty disciple of the Stoa?

No. XVI.—Page 12. Col. 1.

ON DR JOHN TAYLOR'S SCHEME OF ATONEMENT.

The scheme of Atonement, as it is here laid down, is that which has been maintained in the *Letters of Ben Mordecai*, by the learned and ingenious, but prejudiced and erroneous, H. Taylor. It is substantially the same that has been adopted by other theologians, who, admitting a mediatorial scheme in the proper sense of the word, have thought right to found it upon the notion of a pure benevolence, in opposition to that of a retributive justice, in the Deity. But I have selected the statement of it given by this writer, as being the best digested, and most artfully fortified. It seems to avoid that part of the scheme of Dr Taylor of Norwich, which favours the Socinian principles; but, as will appear on examination, it cannot be entirely extricated from them, being originally built on an unsound foundation.

With respect to the system of Dr Taylor of Norwich, as laid down in his *Key to the Apostolic Writings*, and his *Scripture Doctrine of Atonement*, it is obvious to remark, that it is nothing more than an artificial accommodation of Scripture phrases to notions utterly repugnant to Scripture doctrine. A short view of his scheme will satisfy us on this head. "By a sacrifice," he says, (*Script. Doct.* ch. ii. No. 24—5.) "is meant a symbolical address to God, intended to express before him the devotions, affections, &c. by significant, emblematical actions;" and, consequently, he adds, "whatever is expressive of a pious and virtuous disposition, may be rightly included in the notion of a sacrifice; as prayers, thanksgivings, labours," &c. &c.

---

[10] Since the date of the above observation, (2d. edit. 1809.) a Testament has been published by the Unitarians, under the title of *An Improved Version of the New Testament.* Of this *Improved Version* some notice has been already taken in the preceding pages, and more shall be said hereafter.

Having thus widened up the notion of sacrifice, it becomes necessary that sacrificial atonement should be made of equally extensive signification; and, accordingly, because the word כפר, which we commonly translate as *making atonement*, is, as he says, found to be applied in the Old Testament, in its general sense, to all means used for procuring any benefit, spiritual or temporal, at God's hands, whether for ourselves or others, such as obedience, a just life, sacrifices, prayers, intercessions, self-denials, &c. &c., he therefore thinks himself justified in extending to all these that particular species of atonement, which is effected by sacrifice; and thereby he is enabled to pronounce the sacrifice of Christ to be a ground of atonement, without taking in a single idea that truly and properly belongs to sacrifice, or sacrificial atonement. And so, he triumphantly concludes, (*Script. Doct.* &c. No. 152.) that he has made out the sacrifice of Christ to be "truly and properly, in the highest manner, and far beyond any other, piacular and expiatory, to make an atonement for sins, or take them away; not only to give us an example, not only to assure us of remission, or to procure our Lord a commission to publish the forgiveness of sin, but, moreover, to obtain that forgiveness, by doing what God in his wisdom and goodness judged fit and expedient to be done, in order to the forgiveness of sin."

But in what, according to this explication, consists the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice, and how has it made atonement for sin?—He informs us himself, (*Key*, &c. No. 148.) "Obedience, or doing the will of God, was the sacrifice of sweet smelling savour, which made atonement for the sins of the world; in this sense, that God, on account of his (Christ's) goodness and perfect obedience, thought fit to grant unto mankind the forgiveness of those sins that were past; and, farther, erected a glorious and perfect dispensation of grace, exceeding any which had gone before, in means, promises, and prospects, at the head of which he set his Son our Lord Jesus Christ," &c. &c. Thus, then, the obedience of Christ was the sacrifice: and the benefits procured to us by that obedience, constitute the atonement effected by it. And the nature of these benefits, and the way in which they are wrought out for us by Christ's obedience, as we find them explained by this writer, will help us to a just view of the true nature of that which he calls our atonement.

"Truth required," says he, (*Key*, &c. No. 149,) "that grace be dispensed, in a manner the most proper and probable to produce reformation and holiness. Now this is what our Lord has done. He has bought us by his blood, and procured the remission of sins, as what he did and suffered was a proper reason for granting it, and a fit way of conveying and rendering effectual the grace of God," &c. "Now this could be done no otherwise, than by means of a moral kind, such as are apt to influence our minds, and engage us to forsake what is evil, and to work that which is good," &c. — "And what means of this sort could be more effectual, than the heavenly and most illustrious example of the Son of God, shewing us the most perfect obedience to God, and the most generous goodness and love to men, recommended to our imitation, by all possible endearments and engaging considerations?" And again, he says, (*Script. Doct.* No. 170,) "By the blood of Christ God discharges us from the guilt, because the blood of Christ is the most powerful mean of freeing us from the pollution and power of sin." And he adds, "it is the ground of redemption, as it is a mean of sanctification." What then means the *blood of Christ?* "Not a mere corporeal substance; in which case," as he says, "it would be of no more value in the sight of God, than any other thing of the same kind: nor is it to be considered merely in relation to our Lord's death and sufferings, as if mere death or suffering could be of itself pleasing and acceptable to God:" no, the writer informs us, (*Key*, &c. No. 146,) that the "blood of Christ is his perfect obedience and goodness; and that it implies a character," which we are to transcribe into our lives and conduct. And, accordingly, he maintains, (*Script. Doct.* No. 185,) that "our Lord's sacrifice and death is so plainly represented, as a powerful mean of improving our virtue, that we have no sufficient ground to consider its virtue and efficacy in any other light."

To what, then, according to this writer, does the entire scheme of the Atonement amount?—God, being desirous to rescue man from the consequences and dominion of his sins, and yet desirous to effect this in such a way, as might best conduce to the advancement of virtue, thought fit to make forgiveness of all sins that were past, a reward of the meritorious obedience of Christ; and, by exhibiting that obedience as a model for universal imitation, to engage mankind to follow his example, that, being thereby improved in their virtue, they might be rescued from the dominion of sin: and thus making the example of Christ a "mean of sanctification," redemption from sin might thereby be effected. This, as far as I have been able to collect it, is a faithful transcript of the author's doctrine. And what there is in all this, of the nature of Sacrifice or Atonement, (at least so far as it affects those who have lived since the time of Christ,) or in what material respect it differs from the Socinian notion, which represents Christ merely as our instructor and example, I profess myself unable to discover.

I have been thus full in my account of this writer's scheme, because, by some strange oversight, and possibly from his artful accommodation of scriptural phrases to his own notions, whereby he is enabled to express himself in the language of Scripture, his works have received considerable circulation, even among those whose opinions on this subject are of an opposite description. Nay, the erroneous tenets of this author have been conveyed in a collection of *Theological Tracts*, some time since published by an able and learned Prelate in the sister country: and the candidates for orders in this, are by authority enjoined to receive part of their theological instruction from his writings. Those, who wish to see the errors of this scheme more amply reviewed and refuted, I refer to the examination of the doctrine, in the *Scripture Account of Sacrifices*, by Mr Portal, and in the *Criticisms on Modern Notions of Atonement*, by Dr Richie: in the latter of which, particularly, the fallacy of the author's principles, and the gross ambiguity of his terms, are exposed with no less truth than ingenuity.

With respect to *H.* Taylor, who, in his *B. Mord.* partly coincides with this writer in his explication of atonement, it is but justice to say, that he gives a view of the subject, in the main, materially different; inasmuch as he represents Christ's concern for mankind, and his earnest intercession recommended by his meritorious obedience, to be the appointed means of his obtaining from God that kingdom, which empowers him to dispense forgiveness, &c. Whereas Dr. *J.* Taylor makes the obedience of Christ (with regard to such as have lived since his time) the means of redemption, as being the means of man's improvement in virtue; and, so far from attributing any efficacy to Christ's obedience, as operating through intercession, (to which we find, from Scripture, God has frequently bestowed his blessings, see Number IX. p. 41,) he considers the intercessions and prayers of good men for others, in no other light, than as acts of obedience, goodness, and virtue. So that, in fact, the whole of his scheme, when rightly considered, (excepting only with respect to those who lived before Christ, in which part he seems inconsistent with himself, and on his own principles not easy to be understood,) falls in with the notion of good works and moral obedience, as laid down by the Socinian. And here lies the secret of Mr Belsham's remark, (*Review*, &c. p. 18,) that "Dr Taylor has, in general, well explained these Jewish phrases" (viz. propitiation, sacrifice, redemption through Christ's blood, &c.) "in his admirable Key." As Mr Belsham rejects the notion of redemption by Christ, and of faith in Christ, *in toto*, (see *Review*, &c. pp. 18, 104, 145,) it is not difficult to assign the cause of this commendation.

No. XVII. — Page 12. Col. 2.

THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT FALSELY CHARGED WITH THE PRESUMPTION OF PRONOUNCING ON THE NECESSITY OF CHRIST'S DEATH.

That men could not have been forgiven, unless Christ had suffered to purchase their forgiveness, is no part of the doctrine of Atonement, as held by the Church of England. What God could, or could not have done, it presumes not to pronounce. What God declares he has done, that merely it asserts; and on his express word alone is it founded. But it is to be remembered, that on this, as on many other occasions, that *à priori* reasoning, which so frequently misleads those who object to the doctrines of our Church, is imputed by them to us. Not being themselves in the habit of bowing with humble reverence to the Sacred Word, they consider not that we speak merely its suggestions;[1] and that, if we do at any time philosophize, it is but to follow, not to lead, the meaning of Scripture. To enter into the councils of the Almighty, and to decide what Infinite Wisdom must have determined, under a constitution of things different from the present, were a speculation not less absurd, than it is impious. Of this even the few writers, whose language has, by a rigorous interpretation, been forced into a ground for the above charge against the doctrine of atonement, are perfectly innocent: for it never occurred to them to suppose a constitution of things different from that which Divine Wisdom has appointed.

---

[1] The language of Witsius upon this subject is worth attending to. "Supposito extare Revelationem de mysteriis, at inquiri in sensum verborum quibus ista Revelatio mihi exponitur; non est in ista inquisitione ita procedendum, ut primo rationem meam consulam, quid ea, in idearum ac notionum suarum scriniis, rei de qua agitur simile aut adversum habeat, ut secundum eas quas ibi invenio notiones verba revelationis exponam, id unice operam dans, ut sensum tandem aliquem quantâ maximâ possum commoditate iis dem; qui istis meis prænotionibus optime conveniat. Sed attendendum est ad ipsa verba, quid in omnibus suis circumstantiis significare apta nata sint, quidque secundum Scripturæ stilum significare soleant; atque hâc viâ reperto sensu quem verba *sine torsione* per se fundunt, secure in eo acquiescendum est, omniaque rationis scita subjicienda sunt isti sensui quem iis me verbis docet Deus." To these observations he subjoins an example of the opposite modes of investigating the sense of Scripture by the philosophizing and the humble inquirer, applying the former epithet to Socinus, and taking for the particular subject of investigation the passage in Joh. i. 14, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. — "Socinus ita procedit: nihil invenit in toto rationis suæ penu, quod ipsi repræsentet, Deum ita humanæ unitum naturæ, ut ea unam cum ipso constituat personam; ideoque talem conceptum absurdum Deoque injuriosum esse sciscit. *Id supponit ad horum verborum explicationem se accingens*: idcirco omnes ingenii sui nervos intendit, ut sensum aliquem iis applicet, qui ab isthâc assertione remotissimus sit. *Sollicitat verba singula, sollicitat nexum eorum, flectit, torquet, omnia agit, ne id dicere videantur quod dicunt.* Nos longe aliter procedendum existimamus. Accedimus ad hanc pericopam simplici atque humili mente *audituri atque accepturi quidquid Deo nos placeat docere.* Consideramus verba in nativo suo significatu, et prout passim in sacris literis usurpantur; expendimus quid λόγος notet secundum phrasin Johannis, quid γίνεσθαι, quid σάρξ: consideramus quomodo alibi de hâc re sacræ literæ loquantur. Ex his omnibus formamus sensum, quem recipimus humili fidei obsequio firmiterque apud animum nostrum statuimus, Filium Dei humanam naturam tam arcte sibi junxisse, ut idem et Deus et homo sit: et quamvis nostra ratio nihil unquam huic rei simile invenerit, tamen eam verissimam esse, quia verba Dei hoc docent. Qui ita, ut Socinus, instituunt, eos ex suo penu multa in verbum Dei inferre necesse est: quâ re ei insignis fit injuria. Qui uti nos, illi cogitationes

When, therefore, Grotius, Stillingfleet, and Clarke, are charged (as they are in H. Taylor's *B. Mord.* Let. 5) with contending for "the necessity of a vindication of God's honour, either by the suffering of the offenders, or by that of Christ in their room," they are by no means to be considered as contending, that it was impossible for God to have established such a dispensation as might enable him to forgive the sinner without some satisfaction to his justice (which is the sense forcibly put upon their words:) but that, according to the method and dispensation which God's wisdom has chosen, there results a moral necessity of such vindication, founded in the wisdom and prudence of a Being, who has announced himself to mankind, as an upright Governor, resolved to maintain the observance of his laws.

That by the necessity spoken of, is meant but a moral necessity, or, in other words, a fitness and propriety, Dr Clarke himself informs us; for he tells us, (Sermon 137, vol. ii. p. 142, fol. ed.) that, "when the honour of God's laws had been diminished by sin, it was reasonable and necessary, in respect of God's wisdom in governing the world, that there should be a vindication," &c. And again, (Sermon 138, vol ii. p. 150,) in answer to the question, "Could not God, if he had pleased, absolutely, and of his supreme authority, without any sufferings at all, have pardoned the sins of those, whose repentance he thought fit to accept?" he says, "It becomes not us to presume to say he had not power so to do:" but that there seems to be a fitness, in his testifying his indignation against sin; and that "the death of Christ was necessary, to make the pardon of sin reconcileable, not perhaps, absolutely, with strict justice, (for we cannot presume to say that God might not, consistently with mere justice, have remitted as much of his own right as he pleased;) but it was necessary, at least, in this respect, to make the pardon of sin consistent with the wisdom of God, in his good government of the world; and to be a proper attestation of his irreconcileable hatred against all unrighteousness."

That the word *necessary* is imprudently used by Dr Clarke and others, I readily admit; as it is liable to be misunderstood, and furnishes matter of cavil to those who would misrepresent the whole of the doctrine. But it is evident from the passages I have cited, that, so far from considering the sacrifice of Christ as a debt paid to, because rigorously exacted by, the divine justice, it is represented by Dr Clarke, and generally understood, merely as a fit expedient, demanded by the wisdom of God, whereby mercy might be safely administered to sinful man. Now, it is curious to remark, that H. Taylor, who so warmly objects to this notion of a necessity of vindicating God's honour, as maintained by Clarke, &c., when he comes to reply to the Deist, in defence of the scheme of Christ's mediation, uses a mode of reasoning that seems exactly similar: "God (*B. Mordec.* Let. 5,) was not made placable by intercession; but was ready and willing to forgive, before, as well as after: and only waited to do it in such a manner as might best shew his regard to righteousness." Is not this in other words saying, There was a fitness, and consequently a moral necessity, that God should forgive sins through the intercession and meritorious obedience of Christ, for the purpose of vindicating his glory as a righteous Governor?

The profound Bishop Butler makes the following observations upon the subject of this number:—"Certain questions have been brought into the subject of redemption, and determined with rashness, and, perhaps, with equal rashness contrary ways. For instance, whether God could have saved the world by other means than the death of Christ, consistently with the general laws of his government? And, had not Christ come into the world, what would have been the future condition of the better sort of men; those just persons over the face of the earth, for whom, Manasses in his prayer asserts, repentance was not appointed?—The meaning of the first of these questions is greatly ambiguous: and neither of them can properly be answered, without going upon that infinitely absurd supposition, that we know the whole of the case. And, perhaps, the very inquiry, What would have followed if God had not done as he has? may have in it some very great impropriety, and ought not to be carried on any farther than is necessary to help our partial and inadequate conceptions of things." (Butler's *Analogy*, p. 240.)—Such were the reflections of that great divine and genuine philosopher, who at the same time maintained the

---

suas ex verbo Dei hauriunt, quibus rationis suæ penum locupletent, quod Deo gloriosum est."—*Misc. Sacr.* tom. ii. pp. 591, 592. If the spirit which governed Socinus in his critical investigation of the sacred text has been fairly described by Witsius in the passage which has just been cited, it must be unnecessary to add, that his followers of the present day have in no respect departed from the example of their master.

doctrine of Atonement in its legitimate strictness. Will it then still be said, that divines of the Church of England uphold, as a part of that doctrine, the position, that men could not have been saved, had not Christ died to purchase their forgiveness?

No. XVIII.—Page 13. Col. 1.

ON THE MODE OF REASONING WHEREBY THE SUFFICIENCY OF GOOD WORKS WITHOUT MEDIATION IS ATTEMPTED TO BE DEFENDED FROM SCRIPTURE.

Dr Priestley enumerates a great variety of texts to this purpose, in his third paper of the signature of Clemens, (*Theol. Repos.* vol. i.) Dr Sykes in the second chapter of his *Scripture Doctrine of Redemption*, and H. Taylor, in his 5th and 6th Letters, (*B. Mord.*) have done the same. Dr Priestley adds to these texts, the instances of Job, David, Hezekiah, Nehemiah, and Daniel, to shew that on good works alone dependence was to be placed for acceptance: and that the pardon of sin is every where in Scripture represented as dispensed solely on account of man's personal virtue, without the least regard to the sufferings or merit of any being whatever.

A great display is constantly made of texts of this nature, by all who oppose the received doctrine of atonement. But it is to be remarked, that, as they all amount merely to this, that repentance and a good life are acceptable to God, the inference derived from them can only have weight against that doctrine, when its supporters shall disclaim repentance and a good life, as necessary concomitants of that faith in Christ's merits, whereby they hope to be saved; or, when it shall be made to appear from Scripture, that these are of themselves sufficient. But do those writers who dwell so much on good works in opposition to the doctrine of Atonement, seriously mean to insinuate, that the advocates of this doctrine endeavour to stretch the beneficial influence of Christ's death to the impenitent and disobedient? — Or can it be necessary to remind them, that obedience and submission to the divine will are the main ingredients of that very spirit, which we hold to be indispensable to the producing and perfecting of a Christian faith! And again; do they wish to infer, that, because these qualities are acceptable to God, they are so in themselves, and independent of all other considerations? Is it forgotten, that, whilst some parts of Scripture speak of these as well pleasing to God, others, not less numerous, might be adduced to shew, that besides these something more is required? Dr Priestley, indeed, fairly asserts, that nothing more is required; and that the language of Scripture every where represents repentance, and good works, as sufficient, of themselves, to recommend us to the divine favour, (*Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 155.) How then does he get over those declarations of Scripture? — He shall speak for himself.

"It certainly must be admitted," (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 252,) "that some texts do seem to represent the pardon of sin, as dispensed in consideration of something else than our repentance, or personal virtue; — and according to their literal sense, the pardon of sin is in some way or other procured by Christ. But since the pardon of sin is sometimes represented, as dispensed in consideration of the sufferings, sometimes of the merit, sometimes of the resurrection, and even of the life and obedience of Christ; when it is sometimes Christ, and sometimes the Spirit, that intercedes for us; when the dispensing of pardon is sometimes said to be the proper act of God the Father; and again, when it is Christ that forgives us; we can hardly hesitate in concluding, that these must be, severally, partial representations, in the nature of figures and allusions, which at proper distances are allowed to be inconsistent: — and from so vague a representation of a matter of fact, founded on texts which carry with them so much the air of figure, allusion, and accommodation, reason and common sense compel us to appeal to the plain general tenor of Scripture," which he pronounces to be in favour of the sufficiency of good works. — And thus a great part of Scripture is swept away at one stroke, under the name of figure, allusion, &c. &c. And because Christ is pointed out to us, as the means of our salvation, in every light in which he is viewed, (for as to the Father and the Holy Spirit being spoken of, as also concerned in the work of our Redemption, this creates no difficulty,) reason and common sense compel us to pronounce him as not connected with our salvation in any.

This furnishes an additional specimen of the way in which Scripture is treated, by our modern *rational* commentators. A number of texts, enforcing a spirit of humble submission to God's will, which is by no means inconsistent with, but, on the contrary, includes in its nature, a spirit of Christian faith, are taken literally, as not implying this faith, because it is not expressly named. And then another set of passages, in which this faith is expressly named, and literally required, are set aside as figurative. And it is pronounced, upon the whole, that common sense is to decide the matter. — And thus, by rejecting one set of passages entirely as figurative; and then by explaining another set literally and independently, with which the former were connected, and would have perfectly coalesced, so as to afford a satisfactory and consistent meaning; the point is clearly made out. Relying upon this method, which Dr Priestley has discovered, of retaining whatever establishes his opinion, and rejecting whatever makes against it, Mr Belsham may, indeed, safely challenge the whole body of the orthodox to produce a single text, that shall stand in opposition to his and Dr Priestley's dogmas.

But, moreover, it has been well remarked, that all such declarations in Scripture, as promise pardon to repentance, and are thence inferred to pronounce repentance of itself sufficient, as they were subsequent to the promise of a Redeemer, must be altogether inconclusive, even viewed in a distinct and independent light, inasmuch as it may have been in virtue of the pre-ordained atonement that this repentance was accepted. And as to the force of the word *freely*, on which not only Dr Priestley relies very much, but also Dr Sykes in his *Scripture Doctrine of Redemption* and H. Taylor, in the beginning of his Sixth Letter, (*B. Mord. Apol.*) it is obvious, that nothing more is meant by passages that employ this expression in describing God's forgiveness of sinners, than that this forgiveness was free with respect to any merits on the part of man, or any claim which, from repentance, or any other cause, he might be supposed to possess: since, admitting such claim, it would not be free, but earned. And in this very sense it is, that Dr J. Taylor himself, in his *Key*, &c. (No. 67,) contends that the word *free* is to be understood; "the blessing of redemption being, as he says, with regard to us, of free grace — that is, not owing to any obedience of ours." — Any other application of the term must make the word *free* synonymous with unconditional; in which case, forgiveness could not be a free gift, if repentance were required to obtain it; that is, unless it were extended indiscriminately to the impenitent as well as the penitent. So that, in fact, the very use of the word *free*, as applied to God's forgiveness of men, is so far from supporting the opinion of the sufficiency of repentance in itself, that it goes to establish the direct contrary: clearly evincing, that repentance can give no claim to forgiveness. — See some excellent reasoning on this subject, in the judicious discourses, delivered at the Bampton Lecture, by Mr Veysie, Serm. 6 and 7.

No. XIX.—Page 13. Col. 1.

THE WANT OF A DISCOVERABLE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE MEANS AND THE END, EQUALLY APPLIES TO EVERY SCHEME OF ATONEMENT.

Dr J. Taylor illustrates this matter by a familiar parallel, (*Key*, &c. No. 151.) — To the question "Wherein is Christ's love and obedience a just foundation of the divine grace?" he answers, that he knows not how to explain himself better than by the following instance: — There have been masters willing, now and then, to grant a relaxation of study, or even to remit deserved punishment, in case any one boy, in behalf of the whole school, or of the offender, would compose a copy of Latin verses. This at once shewed the master's love and lenity, was a proper expedient for promoting learning and benevolence to the society of little men, training up for future usefulness, &c. — and one may say, that the kind verse-maker purchased the favour in both cases, or that his learning, industry, goodness, and compliance with the governor's will and pleasure, was a just ground and foundation of the pardon and refreshment, or a proper reason of granting them.

This Dr T. declares to be the best explanation he can give, of his scheme of man's redemption by Christ. And that in this there is any natural connection between the exertions of the individual, and the indulgence granted to the rest of this little society, it is not even pretended. The whole contrivance is admitted as a good expedient, or means, whereby the intended kindness of the master was to be shewn. If, in order to supply a link, whereby they may be drawn into connection, the indulgence granted be supposed as a reward to the exertions and obedience of the individual, as is done by H. Taylor, in his *Ben. Mord. Apology;* then, unless this reward, in the case of Christ, be but ostensibly such, and intended solely as a public exhibition to mankind of the favour with which obedience and good conduct will be viewed by the Deity, (in which case it is not a real reward, but merely a prudent expedient, as before,) it must, of necessity, be admitted, that the trial of Christ's obedience was a principal object in the scheme of his incarnation; for without some trial of his obedience how could it merit a reward? Now in what just sense of the word, there could have been any trial of Christ's obedience, it is for those to consider, who do not mean to degrade the Son of God to the Socinian standard.

The author of the *Scripture Account of Sacrifices* has devised a scheme, the chief object of which is to remedy the want of connection. In this, the sacrifice of Christ is not considered as a wise expedient of an instituted nature merely, but as a natural inducement, whereby God's displeasure against mankind was literally averted by Christ's intercession and mediation, recommended by his great zeal, and interest, in the salvation of men, manifested in the offering up his life in the cause. The author of this scheme has, with great ingenuity, accommodated to his notion the nature of the Patriarchal and Jewish sacrifices; making their efficacy to consist entirely in the force of supplication or intercession, and their nature to be that of a gift, strongly expressive of homage and devotion. This author, however, although his work contains most excellent and instructive matter, is not perfectly consistent: since, to have appointed a scheme of intercession, whereby, agreeably to rectitude, God might be induced to grant forgiveness (and that God did appoint this scheme the author is obliged to confess,) is, in other words, to have planned the redemption of man through the medium of intercession, but not in consequence of it: — in which case, this theory falls in with the notion of instituted means adopted by the rest.

But surely, upon the whole, it is not wonderful, that the grand and mysterious scheme of our Redemption should present to the ambitious curiosity of human intellect the same impediment, which restrains its inquisitive researches in every part of nature: — the *modus operandi*, the connecting link of cause and effect, being itself a mystery impenetrable to human sagacity, equally in things the most familiar and the most obscure. On this subject it were well that the old distinction, laid down by Mr Locke, were remembered by those, who would deem it an insult to have it supposed that they were not perfectly acquainted with the writings of that eminent philosopher.

No. XX.— Page 13. Col. 2.

ON THE SCRIPTURE PHRASE OF OUR BEING RECONCILED TO GOD.

See *Theol. Repos.* vol. i. pp. 177, 178, in which several texts are adduced, to establish this proposition. It is likewise attempted to maintain it on the general ground of the divine immutability: in virtue of which, it is asserted, the sufferings of Christ can produce no change in God: and that in man, consequently, the change is to be brought about. God is, therefore, not to be reconciled to men, but men to God. H. Taylor also (*Ben. Mord. Apol.* pp. 692 — 694,) contends, that "God is never said to be reconciled to the world, because he was never at enmity with it. It was the world that was at enmity with God, and was to be reconciled by coming to the knowledge of his goodness to them." He adduces texts, similar to those above referred to, in confirmation of his opinion; and upon the whole peremptorily asserts, that "the New Testament knows no such language, as that God was reconciled to the world." The same ground had been before taken by Sykes, in his *Script. Doct. of Redemp.* (pp. 56, 426,) and in his *Comm. on Heb.* — "There could be no need," (he says, on Heb. vii. 27,) "of reconciling God to man, when he had already shewn his love to man so far, as to send his Son to reconcile man to God."

The argument adopted by these writers had been long before urged by Crellius, in support of the system of Socinus. And it deserves t be remarked, that all these writers have buil their arguments upon an erroneous acceptatio of the original word, which implies reconciliation. Hammond, and, after him, Le Cler (on Matt. v.24,) remark, that the words καταλλάττεσθαι and διαλλάττεσθαι have a peculia sense in the New Testament: that, wherea in ordinary Greek authors they signify to b pacified, and so reconciled, here, on the othe hand, in the force of the reciprocal Hithpahe among the Hebrews, is implied to reconcil one's self to another, that is, to appease, o obtain the favour of, that other: and in support of this interpretation they adduce instances from Rom. v. 10, 1 Cor. vii. 11, 2 Cor v. 20, and especially Matt. v. 24, in whic last διαλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, must necessaril signify, "Take care that thy brother be reconciled to thee," since that which goes before, i not, that he hath done thee injury, but tho him: and this they derive from the force o the Hebrew word רצה transferred to the Gree verb, in the use of it by Jewish writers. I this sense of the words καταλλάττεσθαι an διαλλάττεσθαι, as applied in the New Testament,[1] all the commentators concur. Se Rosenmüller and Wall on 2 Cor. v. 20, an Whitby on the words, wherever they occu Schleusner, in his excellent Lexicon, confirms by several instances, the explication of th terms here contended for: and Palairet. in hi *Observ. Philolog. in Nov. Test.* Matt. v. 24 maintains that this use of the terms is no confined to the Jewish writers, transferring th force of the verb רצה to the Greek expression but is frequent among writers purely Greek he instances Theano *in Opusc. Mytholog.* an Appian. Alexandr. *de Bell. Civil.* and explain it as an elliptical form, the words εἰς χάρι being understood.

It is evident, then, that the writers wh have founded their objection against the propitiation of the Divinity, on the use of the wor *reconciled* in the New Testament, have attended rather to the force of the term, as applie in the language of the translation, than in tha of the original. But, even without lookin beyond the translation, it seems surprisin that the context did not correct their error since that clearly determines the sense, no only in Matt. v. 24, where it is perfectly obvious and unequivocal, as is shewn in page 13 but also in 2 Cor. v. 19, in which the manne of reconciling the world to God is expressly described, viz. his not imputing their trespasses unto them, that is, his granting them forgiveness. There are, upon the whole, but five places in the New Testament, in which the term is used with respect to God; Rom. v. 10, and xi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 18—20; Ephes. ii. 16, and Col. i. 20, 21. Whoever will take the trouble of consulting Hammond and Whitby on these passages, will be satisfied, that the application is diametrically opposite to that for which the Socinian writers contend. There are but two places besides, in which the term occurs, Matt. v. 24, and 1 Cor. vii. 11, in both of which the application is clear. And it deserves to be particularly noticed, that Dr Sykes (*Script. Doct. of Redemp.* p. 57,) sinks the former passage altogether, and notices the latter alone, asserting that this is the only one, in which the word is used, not in relation to the reconciliation of the world to God: and this, after having inadvertently stated in the preceding page that there were two such passages. This will appear the less unaccountable, when it is considered, that the expression, as applied in Matthew, could be got rid of by no refinement whatever: but that the application in 1 Corinthians (not, indeed, in our translation, which is not sufficiently explicit, but examined in the original,) will appear as little friendly to his exposition, Hammond and Le Clerc have abundantly evinced by their interpretation of the passage.

---

[1] The application of the word διαλλάττεσθαι is precisely th same as is made by the *Seventy*, in their translation of 1 Sam xxix. 4, where they speak of David's "appeasing the anger o Saul." Ἐν τίνι ΔΙΑΛΛΑΓΗΣΕΤΑΙ τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ; "Wherewith shall he *reconcile himself* to his master?" according t our common version. Not, surely, how shall he remove his ow anger against his master; but, how shall he remove his master' anger against him; how shall he restore himself to his master' favour? If any additional instance had been wanted to establish the use of the word in this sense among the Jewish writers this one must prove decisive.

No. XXI.—Page 13. Col. 2.

ON THE TRUE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE LAYING ASIDE OUR ENMITY TO GOD, AND BEING RECONCILED TO GOD.

It is well remarked in the *Theological Repository*, by a writer under the signature *Verus*,[1] that the laying aside our enmity to God must be a necessary qualification for, though without constituting the formal nature of, our reconciliation to God. This judicious distinction places the matter in a fair light. That God will not receive us into favour so long as we are at enmity with him, is most certain; but that thence it should be inferred, that, on laying aside our enmity, we are necessarily restored to his favour, is surely an odd instance of logical deduction.

No. XXII.—Page 14. Col. 1.

ON THE PROOFS FROM SCRIPTURE, THAT THE SINNER IS THE OBJECT OF THE DIVINE DISPLEASURE.

Heb. x. 26, 27, "For if we sin wilfully, after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries:" and again, "For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord:" and again, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God:" and again, (Rom. v. 9, 10,) "Much more, then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him—for if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through his Son," &c. In this last passage, it is not only clearly expressed, that we are from disobedience exposed to the divine displeasure, but also that the way whereby we are rescued from the effects of that displeasure, or, as is here held an equivalent form of expression, reconciled to God, is by the death of Christ.

To quote all the passages that speak a similar language, were a tedious task. Nor indeed was the voice of Revelation wanted to inform men, that the sinner is the object of God's displeasure. Reason has at all times loudly proclaimed this truth: and in that predominating terror, that *Λεισιδαιμονία*, which, as shewn in Number V. has, in every age and clime, disfigured, or rather absorbed, the religion of the Gentiles, the natural sentiment of the human mind may be easily discerned.

What is the language of the celebrated Adam Smith on this subject?—"But if it be meant, that vice does not appear to the Deity to be, for its own sake, the object of abhorrence and aversion, and what, for its own sake, it is fit and right should be punished, the truth of this maxim can, by no means, be so easily admitted. If we consult our natural sentiments, we are apt to fear, lest, before the holiness of God, vice should appear to be more worthy of punishment, than the weakness and imperfection of human nature can ever seem to be of reward. Man, when about to appear before a Being of infinite perfection, can feel but little confidence in his own merit, or in the imperfect propriety of his own conduct. In the presence of his fellow-creatures, he may often justly elevate himself, and may often have reason to think highly of his own character and conduct, compared to the still greater imperfection of theirs. But the case is quite different when about to appear before his infinite Creator. To such a Being, he can scarce imagine, that his littleness and weakness should ever seem to be the proper object, either of esteem or of reward. But he can easily conceive, how the numberless violations of duty, of which he has been guilty, should render him the object of aversion and punishment; neither can he see any reason why the divine indignation should not be let loose, without any restraint, upon so vile an insect, as he is sensible that he himself must appear to be. If he would still hope for happiness, he is conscious that he cannot demand it from justice, but that he must entreat it from the mercy of God. Repentance, sorrow, humiliation, contrition at the thought of his past conduct, are, upon this account, the sentiments which become him, and seem to be the only means which he has left for appeasing that wrath which, he knows, he has justly provoked. He even distrusts the efficacy of all these, and naturally fears, lest the wisdom of God should not, like the weakness of man, be prevailed upon to spare the crime, by the most importunate lamentations of the criminal. Some other intercession, some other sacrifice, some other atonement, he imagines, must be made for him, beyond what he himself is capable of making, before the purity of the divine justice can be reconciled to his manifest offences.

---

[1] This writer I find to have been the Rev. Mr Brekell: a writer certainly deserving of praise, both for the ability with which he combated the sophistry of the heterodox, and for the boldness with which he carried the war into the very camp of the enemy.

"The doctrines of Revelation coincide, in every respect, with those original anticipations of nature; and, as they teach us how little we can depend upon the imperfection of our own virtue, so they shew us, at the same time, that the most powerful intercession has been made, and the most dreadful atonement has been paid for our manifold transgressions and iniquities." (*Theory of Moral Sentiments*, pp. 204—206.)

Such were the reflections of a man, whose powers of thinking and reasoning will surely not be pronounced inferior to those of any even of the most distinguished champions of the Unitarian school, and whose theological opinions cannot be charged with any supposed tincture from professional habits or interests. A layman, (and he too the familiar friend of David Hume,) whose life was employed in scientific, political, and philosophical research, has given to the world those sentiments as the natural suggestions of reason.[1] Yet these are the sentiments which are the scoff of sciolists and witlings. Compare these observations of Adam Smith with what has been said on the same subject in Numbers IV. IX. and XV.

No. XXIII.—Page 14. Col. 1.

INSTANCE, FROM THE BOOK OF JOB, OF SACRIFICE BEING PRESCRIBED TO AVERT GOD'S ANGER.

It was not without much surprise, that, after having written the sentence here referred to, I found, on reading a paper of Dr Priestley's in the *Theol. Rep.* (vol. i. p. 404,) that the Book of Job was appealed to by him as furnishing a decisive proof, not only "that mankind in his time had not the least apprehension that repentance and reformation alone, without the sufferings or merit of any being whatever, would not sufficiently atone for past offences:" but that "the Almighty himself gives a sanction to these sentiments." Let the Book of Job speak for itself: — "The Lord said to Eliphaz the Temanite, My wrath is kindled against thee and thy two friends: for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath. Therefore take unto you now seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt-offering; and my servant Job shall pray for you: for him will I accept: lest I deal with you after your folly," (Job, xlii. 7, 8.) If this be not a sufficient specimen, we are supplied with another in chap. i. 4, 5, in which it is said, that, after the sons of Job had been employed in feasting, "Job sent and sanctified them, and rose up early in the morning, and offered burnt-offerings according to the number of them all: for Job said, It may be that my sons have sinned, and cursed God in their hearts. Thus did Job continually." I leave these without comment, to confront the assertions of Dr Priestley, and to demonstrate the value of his representations of Scripture. I shall only add, that in the very page in which he makes the above assertions, he has quoted from Job a passage that immediately follows the former of those here cited.

No. XXIV.—Page 14. Col. 1.

ON THE ATTRIBUTE OF THE DIVINE JUSTICE.

Dr Priestley (*Theol Rep.* vol. i. p. 417) asserts, that "Justice, in the Deity, can be no more than a modification of that goodness and benevolence, which is his *sole* governing principle:" from which he of course infers, that "under the administration of God, there can be no occasion to exercise any severity on penitent offenders;" or, in other words, that repentance must of itself, from the nature of the Deity, cancel all former offences; and that the man who has spent a life of gross vice and audacious impiety, if he at any time reform, shall stand as clear of the divine displeasure, as he who has uniformly, to the utmost of his power, walked before his God in a spirit of meek and pious obedience. This is certainly the necessary result of pure benevolence: nay, the same principle followed up must exclude punishment in all cases whatever; the very notion of punishment being incompatible with pure benevolence. But surely it would be a strange property of *justice*, (call it, with Dr Priestley, a modification of benevolence, or whatever else he pleases,) to release all from punishment; the hardened and unrelenting offender, no less than the sincerely contrite, and truly humbled penitent.

---

[1] When these observations were before committed to the press, I was not aware that the pious reflections, to which they particularly advert, are no longer to be found as constituting a part of that work from which they have been quoted. The fact is, that in the later editions of the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, no one sentence appears of the extract which has been cited above, and which I had derived from the first edition, the only one that I possessed. This circumstance, however, does not in any degree affect the truth of what had been said by the author, nor the justness of the sentiments which he had uttered in a pure and unsophisticated state of mind. It evinces, indeed, that he did not altogether escape the infection of David Hume's society; and it adds one proof more to the many that already existed, of the danger, even to the most enlightened, from a familiar contact with infidelity. How far Adam Smith's partiality to Hume did ultimately carry him, may easily be collected from his emphatical observations on the character of his deceased friend, to which I shall have occasion to direct the reader's attention in another part of this work.

But in his use of the term *justice*, as applied to the Deity, is not Dr Priestley guilty of most unworthy trifling? Why speak of it as "a modification of the divine benevolence," if it be nothing different from that attribute? and if it be different from it, how can benevolence be the "*sole* governing principle" of the divine administration? The word *justice*, then, is plainly but a sound made use of to save appearances, as an attribute called by that name has usually been ascribed to the Deity; but in reality nothing is meant by it, in Dr Priestley's application of the term, different from pure and absolute benevolence. This is likewise evident, as we have seen, from the whole course of his argument. Now, could it be conceded to Dr Priestley, that the whole character of God is to be resolved into simple benevolence, then the scheme, which, by rejecting the notion of divine displeasure against the sinner, involves impunity of guilt, might fairly be admitted. But, as it has been well remarked, "If rectitude be the measure and rule of that benevolence, it might rather be presumed, that the scheme of redemption would carry a relation to sinners, in one way as objects of mercy, in another as objects of punishment; that God 'might be just, and *yet* the justifier of him that believeth' in the Redeemer." See the second of Holmes's *Four Tracts*, in which he confirms, by parallel instances, the use of the word *καὶ*, as applied in the above passage by Whitby in his Paraphrase.—On the subject of this Number at large, see also Numbers IV. XXII. and Balguy's *Essay on Redemption.*

No. XXV.—Page 14. Col. 1.

ON THE TEXT IN JOHN, DESCRIBING OUR LORD AS "THE LAMB OF GOD, WHICH TAKETH AWAY THE SINS OF THE WORLD."

What efforts are made to get rid of those parts of Scripture, that lend support to the received doctrine of the sacrifice of Christ, is evident from the remark made on this passage by the ingenious author of *Ben Mordecai's Apology.* "The allusion here," he says, "seems to be made to the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah; but the lamb is not there considered as a lamb to be *sacrificed,* but as a lamb to be *sheared.*"—(Let. vii. p. 794, 2d ed. 8vo.) Now upon what principle this author is enabled to pronounce that the allusion in this place is made to the lamb spoken of in Isaiah, rather than to the paschal lamb, or to the lamb which, under the Jewish law, was offered daily for the sins of the people, it is difficult to discover. His only reason seems to be, that, in admitting the reference to either of the two last, the notion of sacrifice is necessarily involved; and the grand object in maintaining the resemblance to a lamb that was to be sheared, not slain, was to keep the *death* of Christ out of view as much as possible.

But of the manner in which Scripture is here used to support a particular hypothesis, we shall be better able to form a right judgment, when it shall have appeared that the reference in John is not made to Isaiah; and also, that the lamb in Isaiah is considered as a lamb to be *slain.*

The latter is evident, not only from the entire context, but from the very words of the prophet, which describe the person spoken of (liii. 7,) to be "brought as a lamb to the *slaughter;*" so that one cannot but wonder at the pains taken to force the application to this passage of Isaiah, and still more at the peremptory assertion, that the lamb here spoken of was a lamb to be sheared only. It is true, indeed, there is subjoined, "and as a sheep before her *shearers* is dumb;" but if Mr Wakefield's remark on Acts, viii. 32, in which he contends that the word translated *shearer* should have been translated *slayer*, be a just one, the objection vanishes at once. Retaining, however, the clause as it stands in the present version, that which follows,—"so he openeth not his mouth,"—clearly explains, that the character intended to be conveyed by the prophet, in the whole of this figurative representation, was that of a meek and uncomplaining resignation to suffering and death.

And this also shews us that the passage in Isaiah could not have been the one immediately referred to by John; because in it the lamb is introduced but incidentally, and as furnishing the only adequate resemblance to that character, which was the primary object of the prophet's contemplation: whereas, in the Baptist's declaration, that Jesus was "*the* Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world," the reference must naturally be to a lamb before described, and understood, as possessed of some similar or corrrsponding virtue, such as Saint Peter alludes to when he says, (1 Peter, i. 18, 19,) "Ye were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish." In this an allusion is evidently made to a lamb whose blood, under the Jewish law, bore analogy to that of Christ: that is, either to the paschal lamb, by the sprinkling of whose blood the Israelites had been delivered from destruction, or to the lamb that was daily sacrificed for the sins of the people, and which was bought with that half shekel, which all the Jews yearly paid, *εἰς λύτρον τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν, ἐξιλάσασθαι περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν*, "as the price of redemption of their lives, to make an atonement for them," (Exod. xxx. 12, 14, 16.) With a view to this last it is, that Saint Peter most probably uses the expressions, "Ye were not redeemed with silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb," &c. *i. e.* it is not by a lamb purchased with silver and gold that you have been redeemed, but by Christ, that truly spotless Lamb, which the former was intended to prefigure; who, by shedding his blood, has effectually redeemed you from the consequences of your sins; or, as the Baptist had before described him, "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world:" and as Saint John, who records these expressions of the Baptist, again speaks of him in the Apocalypse, (v. 9,) the Lamb which had been *slain*, "and by its blood redeemed men out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation," or, in other words, "that had taken away the sins of the world."

The author indeed admits (what it was impossible for him to deny) that, in the Apocalypse, Christ "is spoken of as a lamb that was *slain*:" but then he says, that "he is not spoken of as a vicarious sacrifice; for the Jews had no sacrifices of that nature," (vol. ii. p. 789.) Be it so for the present: it is clear, however, that the lamb to which the allusion is made in the figurative representations of Christ in the New Testament, is a lamb that was slain and sacrificed; and that nothing but the prejudices arising from a favourite hypothesis could have led this writer to contend against a truth so notorious, and upon grounds so frivolous.

No. XXVI.—Page 14. Col. 2.

ON THE MEANING OF THE WORD "PROPITIATION" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The word *ἱλασμὸς*, translated *propitiation*, occurs in the New Testament only in the two passages noticed in the page here referred to, viz. 1 John, ii. 2, and iv. 10. Its true force, however, is obvious; since, as appears from the application of the words *ἱλασμὸς, ἱλάσκομαι, ἐξιλάσκομαι*, by the Seventy in the Old Testament, it corresponds to the Hebrew word כפר, and therefore implies the making atonement, and thereby effecting a reconciliation with, or propitiating the Deity.—The Greek translation of Ezekiel (xliv. 29) has made it synonymous with חטאה, a sin offering; and thus, H. Taylor (*B. Mord.* p. 808) asserts, that the word should be here translated.

But it is curious to remark, that this writer has been so far led away by a desire to maintain the system which he has adopted, that, in two pages after, he goes on to shew, that no one circumstance belonging to the sin-offering is to be found in the sacrifice of Christ. As producing indeed "the effect of the sin-offerings, remission of sins," he concludes it may be so called, though possessing no one ingredient that enters into the composition of a sin-offering. His radical error on the Scripture use of the word *reconciliation*, (which has been already examined,) prevented him from admitting the term *propitiation*, or *propitiatory sacrifice*: sin-offering he therefore substitutes, and then endeavours to fritter this away. — It deserves to be noticed, that even Sykes, whose attachment to the orthodox opinions will not be suspected to have much biassed his judgment on this subject, considers *ἐξιλάσκεσθαι* to be correspondent to כפר, and explains both by the words *expiate*, *atone*, *propitiate*, "whatever the means were," he adds, "by which this was to be done." — *Essay on Sacrifices*, pp. 132, 135.

In Rom. iii. 25, *ἱλαστήριον*[1] is translated in the same sense with *ἱλασμὸς*, "a propitiation," or "propitiatory offering," *θῦμα*, or *ἱερεῖον*, being understood as its substantive: and although it be true, as Krebsius observes, that the Seventy always apply this term to the mercy-seat, or covering of the ark, yet strong arguments appear in favour of the present translation.

---

[1] Ἱλαστήριον—subaudiendum videtur *ἱερεῖον* aut *θῦμα*, *expiatorium sacrificium*, quemadmodum eadem ellipsis frequentissima est apud *τοὺς ό* in voce *σωτήριον*, et in *χαριστήριον*, apud Auctores. Hesychius exponit *Καθάρσιον* eadem ellipsi; nisi substantive sumptum idem significare malis quod *ἱλασμὸν* *propitiationem*, ut Vulgatus vertit, consentiente Beza. Ejus generis substantiva sunt *δικαστήριον*, *θυσιαστήριον*, *φυλακτήριον*, et similia; adeoque Christus eodem modo vocabitur *ἱλαστήριον*, quo *ἱλασμὸς*, 1 Joh. ii. 2, et iv. 10. Elsner. *Obs. Sacr.* tom. ii. pp. 20, 21.

See Schleusner on the word: also Josephus, as referred to by Krebsius and Michaelis.[2] Veysie (*Bampt. Lect.* pp. 219, 220, 221) has well enumerated its various significations.

No. XXVII.—Page 14. Col. 2.

ON THE TEXTS DESCRIBING CHRIST'S DEATH AS A SACRIFICE FOR SIN.

Isa. liii. 5—8. Matt. xx. 28; xxvi. 28 Mark, x. 45. Acts, viii. 32, 33. Rom. iii. 24, 25; iv. 25; v. 6—10. 1 Cor. v. 7; xv. 3. 2 Cor. v. 21. Eph. i. 7. Col. i. 14. 1 Tim. ii. 6. Heb. i. 3; ii. 17; ix. 12—28; x. 10, 14, 18. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. 1 John, iv. 10. Rev. v. 9—12; xiii. 8. All which, and several other passages, speak of the death of Christ in the same sacrificial terms that had been applied to the sin-offerings of old. So that they who would reject the notion of Christ's death, as a true and real sacrifice for sin, must refine away the natural and direct meaning of all these passages: or, in other words, they must new-model the entire tenor of Scripture language, before they can accomplish their point.

Dr Priestley, indeed, although he professes (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 125) to collect "*all* the texts in which Christ is represented as a sacrifice, either expressly, or by plain reference," has not been able to find so many to this purpose as have been here referred to. After the most careful research, he could discover but a very few; and of these he remarks, that "the greater part are from one Epistle, which is allowed in other respects to abound with the strongest figures, metaphors, and allegories:" and these being rejected, "the rest," he says, "are too few to bear the very great stress that has been laid upon them:"—and thus they are all discarded with one sweeping remark, that they carry with them the air of figure, and that had Christ's death been considered as the intended antitype of the sacrifices under the law, this would have been asserted in the fullest manner, and would have been more frequently referred to. We are here furnished with an instance of the most expeditious and effectual method of evading the authority of Scripture.—First, overlook a considerable majority, and particularly of the strongest texts, that go to support the doctrine you oppose; in the next place assert, that, of the remainder, a large proportion belongs to a particular writer, whom you think proper to charge with metaphor, allegory, &c. &c.: then object to the residue, as too few on which to rest any doctrine of importance: but, lest even these might give some trouble in the examination, explode them at once with the cry of figure, &c. &c. This is the treatment that Scripture too frequently receives from those who choose to call themselves rational and enlightened commentators.

There are two texts, however, on which Dr Priestley has thought fit to bestow some critical attention, for the purpose of shewing that they are not entitled to rank even with those few that he has enumerated, as bearing a plausible resemblance to the doctrine in question. From his reasoning on these, we shall be able to judge what the candour and justice of his criticisms on the others would have been, had he taken the trouble to produce them. The two texts are, Isai. liii. 10, "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin;" and 2 Cor. v. 21, "He made him sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

Against the first he argues from the disagreement in the versions, which, he observes, may lead us to suspect some corruption in our present copies of the Hebrew text. Our translation, he says, makes a change of person in the sentence—"*He* hath put him to grief—when *thou* shalt make his soul an offering for sin, *he* shall see his seed," &c., in which, he adds, it agrees with no ancient version whatever. In the next place, he asserts, that the Syriac *alone* retains the sense of our translation, and at the same time remarks that this version of the Old Testament is but of little authority. He then gives the reading of the clause by the LXX and the Arabic, "If ye offer a sacrifice for sin, your soul shall see a long-lived offspring." He concludes with the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan, which is different from all. And from the whole he draws this result, that the uncertainty as to the true reading of the original must render the passage of no authority. (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 127.)

But the real state of the case is widely different from this representation: for, 1. Our translation does not absolutely pronounce upon the change of person, so as to preclude an agreement with the ancient versions. 2. The Syriac is not the only version that retains the sense of ours, the Vulgate, which Dr Priestley has thought proper to omit, exactly corresponding in sense. 3. The Syriac version of the Old

---

[2] Michaelis says, (*Translation by Marsh*, vol. i. p. 187,) "Josephus, having previously observed that the blood of the martyrs had made atonement for their countrymen, and that they were *ὡσπὲρ ἀντίψυχον* (victima substituta) *τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἁμαρτίας*, continues as follows, *καὶ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐκείνων, καὶ τοῦ* ʼΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΥ *τοῦ θανάτου αὐτῶν ἡ θεία πρόνοια τὸν ʼΙσραὴλ διέσωσε!*" On the use of the word *ἱλαστήριον* amongst Jewish writers, and the strict propitiatory sense in which it was used by the Hellenistic Jews, I deem this passage from Josephus decisive; and I have but little hesitation in defying the utmost ingenuity of Socinian exposition to do away the force of its application to the subject before us.—Michaelis, in p. 179, remarks, that "in Rom. iii. 25, *ἱλαστήριον* has been taken by some in the sense of *mercy-seat*, but that Kypke has properly preferred the translation *propitiatory sacrifice.*"—Michaelis was surely no superficial nor bigoted expositor of holy writ.

Testament, so far from being of little authority, is of the very highest. 4. The concurrence of the LXX and the Arabic is not a joint, but a single testimony, inasmuch as the Arabic is known to be little more than a version of the LXX,[1] and, consequently, can lend no farther support, than as verifying the reading of the LXX, at the time when this version was made: and that it does not even authenticate the reading of the LXX, at an early day, may be collected from the *Prolegom.* of Walton, and Kennicott's *State of the Hebr. Text*, as referred to in the note below. 5. The Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan is remarkable (as Bishop Lowth states in his *Prelim. Dissert.*) "for a wordy, allegorical explanation," so that an exactness of translation is not here to be expected. And, lastly, the apparent differences of the versions may be explained by, and fairly reconciled to, the present reading of the Hebrew text.

These several points will be best explained, by beginning with the last. The state of the Hebrew text, as it stands in all our present Bibles, (at least in such of them as I have consulted, viz. Walton's *Polyglot*, Michaelis, Houbigant, Kennicott, Doederlein, &c., and scarcely undergoing any variation, however minute, from the prodigious variety of copies examined by Kennicott and De Rossi,) is as follows, אם תשים אשם נפשו יראה זרע יאריך ימים. Now these words, as they stand, manifestly admit of a two-fold translation, according as the word תשים is considered to be of the second person masculine, or the third person feminine,—viz. when *thou* shalt make his soul an offering for sin, or, when *his soul* shall make an offering for sin: and though, with Ludovicus de Dieu, our present translation of the Bible, has followed the former in the text, yet has it, with Coccejus, Montanus, Junius and Tremellius, Castellio, and almost every other learned expositor of the Bible, retained the latter, inserting it in the margin, as may be seen in any of our common Bibles. It deserves also to be remarked, that, in the old editions of our English Bible, (See Matthewe's, Cranmer's, or the *Great Bible*, and Taverner's,—see also the Bibles in the time of Elizabeth, viz. the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles,—see all, in short, that preceded James's translation,) this latter reading is the only one that is given: and it should be observed, (see Newcome's *Historic. View*, p. 105) that one of the rules prescribed to the translators employed in the last named version, which is the one now in use, was,—"that where a Hebrew or Greek word admitted of two proper senses, one should be expressed in the context, and the other in the margin." Thus it appears, that Dr Priestley must have glanced his eye most cursorily, indeed, upon our English translation, when he charges it so peremptorily with the abrupt change of person.

Again, this very translation, which, beside the older expositors above referred to, has the support of Vitringa and Bishop Lowth, and is perfectly consistent with the most accurate and grammatical rendering of the passage in question, agrees sufficiently with the ancient versions. In sense there is no difference, and whatever variation there is in the expression may be satisfactorily accounted for from a farther examination of the original. Thus, in the Vulgate it is rendered, "when he shall make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see," &c.—and in the Syriac, "the penalty of sin is laid upon his soul," (*i. e.* in other words, his soul is made an offering for sin,) "that he might see," &c. Now the first is a literal translation of the Hebrew, if, only, instead of תשים be read ישים[2], which we may readily suppose some copies of the Hebrew to have done, without introducing the smallest uncertainty into the text. The second will also be found a literal version, if for תשים be read תשם, which may be taken passively, "shall be made." Now it appears from Kennicott's various readings, that one MS. supports this reading. But there is a remark on this head made by Houbigant, (which has been overlooked both by Bishop Lowth, and the commentator on Isaiah who has succeeded him,[3]) that seems to deserve considerable notice. "The word," he says, "should be תשם, in the passive voice: for that, as Morinus observes, the Jews, before the vowel points were introduced, were used to mark the passive by the letter י interposed; and that here, this Chaldaism had been allowed to remain by the transcriber."—See Houbigant in loc.

Again, with respect to the LXX version of this passage, (for as to the Arabic it need not be taken into account, for the reasons before stated,) the difference between it and the last mentioned translation is not so great, as on the first view might appear. It is true, the reading of the LXX as given in our *Polyglot*, is ἐὰν δῶτε, "if ye offer:" but it is remarked by Bishop Lowth, that some copies of the LXX read δῶται, "shall be offered:" which agrees exactly with the Syriac. Indeed, as Mr Dodson very properly observes, δῶται may be considered the true reading of the LXX, not only on the authority of Clemens R. and Justin, who read it so; but also from the custom which prevails in Greek MSS. of writing ε instead of αι. This practice is noticed by Wotton, in his edition of Clem. R. (p. 142,) on the words ϖϱοτϱέπετε ἡμᾶς ἐπ' αὐτῷ, and is well known to all who are conversant in Greek MSS. as obtaining not only at the termination of words, as in the instance taken from Clemens, but in all parts of the word indifferently. This reading is likewise approved by Capellus.[4] Thus far, then, (and this, it is to be noted, is the most important clause in the passage,) the disagreement between the LXX and the other ancient versions is done away. That it differs both from them and the Hebrew text, in some other parts of the sentence, must be allowed; but that from an extensive collation of the several MSS. (which has now happily been at length undertaken,) even these differences may yet be removed, there is much reason to expect. The confirmation of the present reading of the Septuagint by the Arabic version is by no means an argument against this; as that version is not above 900 years old, and may, therefore, have been derived from copies of the Septuagint, not the most perfect. Besides, it deserves to be remarked, that Bishop Lowth (*Prelim. Diss.*) pronounces the Septuagint version of Isaiah to be inferior to that of any other book in the Old Testament; and, in addition to this, to have come down to us in a condition exceedingly incorrect.

---

[1] See Bishop Lowth's *Preliminary Dissert. to his Translation of Isaiah*—and Walton's *Polyglot Prolegom.* 15.—also Kennicott's *State of the Hebr. Text*, vol. ii. pp. 453, 454.

[2] Doederlein translates as if the word were ישים, *ubi vitam suam, ut piaculum, interposuerit;* and adds, that the book *Sohar* (Parascha וישב) particularly warns us that it is so to be read, not תשים.

[3] Mr Dodson was here intended, as being the only person, who (at the date of the first publication of this work) had given to the public a version of Isaiah later than that of Bishop Lowth. But the observation equally applies to Bishop Stock, who has given the latest translation of the Prophet, and who has in like manner overlooked this remark: for whilst he renders the word in a passive sense, "If his life shall *be made* a trespass-offering," he assigns for it a wrong reason; deriving the passive signification from a supposed reflective import of the verb—should be made, or (he says) should render *itself;* forgetting, that if this latter sense belonged to the verb, it would have been given in the form *Hithpahel*, which clearly is not that of the verb תשים.—Dathe's translation of the passage is decisive for the passive signification of the verb: "Quodsi vita ejus ut sacrificium pro peccatis oblata fuerit."

Upon the whole, then, since the present state of the Hebrew text has been shewn to agree with the Syriac, the Vulgate, (both of which, it should be noted, were taken from the Hebrew,—one in the first, the other in the fourth century,) with our English translation, and, in a material part, even with the LXX, we may judge with what fairness Dr Priestley's rejection of the present text, on the ground of the disagreement of the translations with it and with each other, has been conducted. His omission of the Vulgate, his overlooking the marginal translation of our present, and the text of our older English Bibles, and pronouncing peremptorily on their contents in opposition to both; his stating the Arabic as a distinct testimony, concurring with the LXX; and his assertion, that the Syriac version of the Old Testament is confessed to be of little authority, when the direct contrary is the fact, it being esteemed by all biblical scholars as of the very highest — and all this done to darken and discard a part of holy writ — cannot but excite some doubt as to the knowledge or the candour of the critic.

With respect to the Syriac version, Bishop Lowth, in his *Prelim. Dissert.* thus expresses himself. After describing the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan, which he states to have been made about or before the time of our Saviour, he says, "The Syriac stands next in order of time, but is superior to the Chaldee in usefulness and authority, as well in ascertaining as in explaining the Hebrew text: it is a close translation of the Hebrew, into a language of near affinity to it: it is supposed to have been made as early as the first century."—Dr Kennicott also (*State of the Hebr. Text*, vol. ii. p. 355) speaks in the strongest terms of this version, "which," he says, "being very literal and very ancient, is of inestimable value:"—he concludes it to have been "made about the end of the first century, and that it might consequently have been made from Hebrew MSS. almost as old as those which were before translated into Greek:" and he, of course, relies on it for many of the most ancient and valuable readings. The language of De Rossi is, if possible, still stronger, "Versio hæc antiquissima ordinem ipsum verborum sacri textus et literam presse sectatur; et ex versionibus *omnibus* antiquis purior ac tenacior habetur." (*Var Lect. Vet. Test.* Proleg. p. xxxii.) Dathe, also, both in his preface to the Syriac Psalter, and in his *Opuscula*, pronounces in the most peremptory terms in favour of the fidelity and the high antiquity of the Syriac version. In the latter work, particularly, he refers to it as a decisive standard by which to judge of the state of the Hebrew text in the second century. Dath. *Opusc. Coll.* a Rosenm. p. 171. In this high estimate of the Syriac[5] version these great critics but coincide with the suffrages of Pocock, Walton, and all the most learned and profound Hebrew scholars, who in general ascribe it to the apostolic age.—(See Pocock. *Pref.* to Micah, and Walton's *Prolegom.* 13.)—Dr Priestley, however, has said, that "it is confessed to be of little authority!" I have dwelt much too long upon this point, but it is of importance that it should be well understood what reliance is to be placed on the knowledge, and what credit is to be given to the assertions of a writer, whose theological opinions have obtained no small degree of circulation in the sister island, and whose confident assumption of critical superiority, and loud complaints against the alleged backwardness of divines of the Established Church in biblical investigation, might draw the unwary reader into an implicit admission of his gratuitous positions.

---

[4] "Aliquando diversitas citationis a LXX posita est in diversa lectione variantium Codd. Græcorum τῶν LXX; ut Esa. liii. 10, editio Sixtina τῶν LXX habet, ἐὰν δῶτε ϖεϱὶ ἁμαϱτίας, "si dederitis pro peccato," quæ corrupta est lectio. At Justinus cum quibusdam codicibus habet, ἐὰν δῶται, "si datus fuerit," quæ genuina est lectio respondens Hebræo."—*Critica Sacra*, Ludov. Capel. pp. 529, 530.

[5] Although I am here only concerned with the Syriac version of the Old Testament, yet I cannot omit the opportunity of noticing a judicious and satisfactory defence of the high antiquity of what is called the Old Syriac Version of the New Testament, lately given to the public by Dr Laurence. That this version (or the *Peshito*, as it is usually named for distinction,) was the production of the apostolic age, or at least of that which immediately succeeded, had been the opinion of the most eminent critics both in early and modern times. The very learned J. D. Michaelis has maintained the same opinion, in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. ii. pp. 29—38. But in this he has not received the support of his English annotator, Dr Marsh, who contends, that we have no sufficient proof of the existence of this version at a period earlier than the fourth century: ibid. pp. 551—554. Dr Laurence, has, however, clearly shewn, that Dr Marsh's objections are not formidable, and has treated the subject in such a manner as to evince that the alleged antiquity of the version stands upon the strongest grounds of probability. See Laurence's *Dissert. upon the Logos*, pp. 67—74.

I come now to examine his objections against the second text—"He made him *sin* for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." In this passage, the word ἁμαρτία, which is translated *sin*, is considered by Hammond, Le Clerc, Whitby, and every respectable commentator, to mean a sin-offering, or sacrifice for sin: it is so translated expressly by Primate Newcome in his new version. That this is the true meaning of the word will readily be admitted, when it is considered that this is the application of it in the Hebrew idiom; and that Jews, translating their own language into Greek, would give to the latter the force of the corresponding words in the former. And that they have done so, is evident from the use of the word through the entire of the Greek version of the Old Testament, to which the apostles, when speaking in Greek, would naturally have adhered. Dr Middleton, in his answer to Dr Bentley, remarks, that "the whole New Testament is written in a language peculiar to the Jews; and that the idiom is Hebrew or Syriac, though the words be Greek." Michaelis also says, "The language of the New Testament is so intermixed with Hebraisms, that many native Greeks might have found it difficult to understand it." (*Introd. to N. T.* vol. i. p. 100.) Ludovicus Capellus (in speaking of the Greek translators of the Old Testament, whose style, he says, is followed by the writers of the New) asks the question, "Quis nescit, verba quidem esse Græca, at phrases et sermonis structuram esse Hebræam?" (*Crit. Sacr.* p. 522.) And Dr Campbell, in his *Preliminary Dissertations*, pronounces, almost in the words of Capellus, "The phraseology is Hebrew, and the words are Greek."[6] The justice of these observations, as applying particularly to the expression in the present text, is evinced in numerous instances, adduced by Hammond and

---

[6] Ernesti affirms, "Stilus Novi Testamenti recte dicatur *Hebræo-græcus.*" See p. 82, *Inst. Interp. Nov. Test.* Indeed the observations of this writer (pp. 73—88.) are particularly worthy of attention. If the reader should be desirous to see this curious and interesting subject of the style of the New Testament fully and satisfactorily handled, I refer him to the last named work; also to Michaelis's fourth chapter on *the Language of the New Testament* (*Introduction*, &c. vol. i. pp. 97—200,) and particularly to Dr Campbell's first and second *Preliminary Dissertations to the Four Gospels*, &c. At the same time, I must differ widely from Dr Campbell, when he refers (as he does in p. 20, vol. i.) to the Bishop of Gloucester's *Doctrine of Grace*, for the best refutation of the objections against the inspiration of Scripture derived from the want of classical purity in its language. I would, on the contrary, direct the reader's attention to the *Dissertation on the Principles of Human Eloquence*, in which the bold paradoxes of the Bishop are set aside, and the argument placed upon a sound and legitimate basis, by the learned Dr Thomas Leland, formerly a Fellow of this University.

The Bishop, it is well known, had held, that the want of purity in the writings of the New Testament supplies in itself a proof of their divine original; and had defended this position upon reasons nearly subversive of every just notion of the nature of human eloquence. Dr Leland, on the contrary, with a due regard to the principles of eloquence, of taste, and of common sense, and in the direct maintenance of them all against the attacks of this formidable assailant, more discreetly and successfully contended for the truth of this proposition, that "whatever rudeness of style may be discoverable in the writings of the New Testament, it can afford neither proof nor presumption that the authors were not divinely inspired." See p. 97, or rather, indeed, the whole of the judicious discussion from p. 88 to p. 118 of the *Dissertation.* This drew forth a reply in defence of the Bishop, which was distinguished more for point and sarcasm than for ingenuity and strength. Suspicion early fixed upon Dr Hurd as the author. The letters of Warburton and Hurd lately published, prove the suspicion to have been just. It appears, also, that Warburton himself took considerable pains to have the pamphlet printed and circulated in Ireland (*Letters*, &c., pp. 352, 354,) in the confident expectation, that the Irish Professor would be completely put to silence. The effect, however, was otherwise. The Professor returned to the charge with renovated vigour; and by a reply, distinguished by such ability as proved to the opposite party the inexpediency of continuing the contest, closed the controversy. How complete, in the public opinion, was Dr Leland's triumph over both his mitred opponents, may easily be collected from the fact, that, however anxious to give extended circulation to the castigatory *Letter* before it received an answer, they both observed a profound silence upon the subject ever after; and that the letter to Dr Leland, remaining unacknowledged by the author, was indebted for its farther publicity to the very person against whom it was directed, who deemed it not inexpedient, in a new edition of his *Tracts*, to give it a place between the *Dissertation* which caused it, and the defence which it occasioned. The critical decisions of the day were decidedly in favour of Dr Leland. A late Review pronounces, that Leland, "in the opinion of all the world, completely demolished his antagonist." (*Edin. Rev.* vol. xiii. p. 358.) The *Critical Reviews* for July and November 1764, and April, 1765, contain some masterly pieces of criticism upon the *Dissertation* and the *Letter.* But in no work is there a more striking or more honourable testimony borne to Dr Leland's superiority in this controversy, than in that which is entitled *Tracts by Warburton and a Warburtonian;* particularly in the Dedication and Preface prefixed to the *Two Tracts* which the eloquent editor describes as "Children, whom their parents were afraid or ashamed to acknowledge," and which he therefore (compassionately, it certainly cannot be said) determines to present to the public notice. Of these *Two Tracts*, Dr Hurd's well known Letter to Dr Jortin, *On the Delicacy of Friendship*, is one, and his *Letter to Dr Leland*, is the other: and on the subject of these tracts, by which, it is added, Warburton was most extravagantly flattered, Leland most petulantly insulted, and Jortin most inhumanly vilified, severe justice is inflicted upon the author, by the indignant vindicator of the two respectable characters that had been so unworthily attacked. General opinion has long appropriated this publication to a name of no mean note in the republic of letters. Undoubtedly the vigour of conception, the richness of imagery, Whitby in loc. And to this very text the passage from Isaiah, which has just been discussed, bears an exact correspondence; for, as in that "his soul," or life, was to "be made" אשם, *ἁμαρτία*, or as the LXX render it, *ϖερὶ ἁμαρτίας*, "a sin offering,"[7] so here Christ is said to have been made *ἁμαρτία*, "a sin offering;" and "for us," as it must have been from what is immediately after added, that "he knew no sin." For the exact coincidence between these passages, Vitringa (Isa. liii. 10) deserves particularly to be consulted. Among other valuable observations, he shews that *ϖερὶ ἁμαρτίας*, *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας*, and *ἁμαρτία*, are all used by the Greek writers among the Jews in the same sense. Several decisive instances of this, in the New Testament, are pointed out by Schleusner, on the word *ἁμαρτία*.

Now from this plain and direct sense of the passage in 2 Cor. supported by the known use of the word *ἁμαρτία* in Scripture language, and maintained by the ablest commentators on Scripture, Dr Priestley thinks proper to turn away, and to seek in a passage of Romans (viii. 3) to which this by no means necessarily refers, a new explanation, which better suits his theory, and which, as usual with him, substitutes a figurative in place of the obvious and literal sense. Thus, because in Romans God is said to have "sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh," *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*, he would infer, that when in 2 Cor. God is said to have "made him sin," it is merely meant that God had "made him in the likeness of sinful flesh." Nor is he content with this unwarrantable departure from the language of the text, but he would also insinuate (*Th. Rep.* vol. i. p. 128) that the words *ϖερὶ ἁμαρτίας*, which occur in the text in Romans, and which, we have already remarked, are commonly used in Scripture language for a "sin offering," and are so rendered in this place by Primate Newcome, merely imply "for us," availing himself of our present version, which translates the words, "for sin." Such vague and uncritical expositions of Scripture may serve any purpose, but the cause of truth. I have already dwelt longer upon them than they deserve, and shall now dismiss them without farther remark.

---

and the splendour of diction, displayed in those parts of the work which the Editor claims as his own, are such as must reflect honour upon any name. At the same time, it is much to be lamented, that talents and attainments of so high an order, as manifestly belong to the writer, should have been devoted to purposes so little congenial with the feelings of benevolence; and that the same spirit, which pressed forward with such generous ardour to cast the shield over one reputation, should direct the sword with such fierce hostility against another, and exult in inflicting the very species of wound which it was its highest glory to repel.

The eulogium pronounced upon Dr Leland I here seize the opportunity of extracting from this performance. It is sketched by the hand of a master, and is too creditable to the memory of the individual, to be passed over by any one who takes an interest in what relates either to the man, or to the university of which he was an ornament. "Of Leland, my opinion is not, like the Letter-writer's, founded upon hearsay evidence, nor is it determined solely by the great authority of Dr Johnson, who always mentioned Dr Leland with cordial regard and with marked respect. It might, perhaps, be invidious for me to hazard a favourable decision upon his *History of Ireland;* because the merits of that work have been disputed by critics; some of whom are, I think, warped in their judgments by literary, others by national, and more, I have reason to believe, by personal prejudices. But I may with confidence appeal to writings which have long contributed to public amusement, and have often been honoured by public approbation: to the *Life of Philip*, and to the *Translation of Demosthenes*, which the Letter-writer professes to have not read,—to the judicious *Dissertation upon Eloquence*, which the Letter-writer did vouchsafe to read, before he answered it,—to the spirited *Defence* of that Dissertation, which the Letter-writer, probably, has read, but never attempted to answer. The *Life of Philip* contains many curious researches into the principles of government established among the leading states of Greece: many sagacious remarks on their intestine discords: many exact descriptions of their most celebrated characters, together with an extensive and correct view of those subtle intrigues, and those ambitious projects, by which Philip, at a favourable crisis, gradually obtained an unexampled and fatal mastery over the Grecian Republics. In the *Translation of Demosthenes* Leland unites the man of taste with the man of learning, and shews himself to have possessed, not only a competent knowledge of the Greek language, but that clearness in his own conceptions, and that animation in his feelings, which enabled him to catch the real meaning, and to preserve the genuine spirit, of the most perfect orator that Athens ever produced. Through the *Dissertation upon Eloquence*, and the *Defence* of it, we see great accuracy of erudition, great perspicuity and strength of style, and, above all, a stoutness of judgment, which, in traversing the open and spacious walks of literature, disdained to be led captive either by the sorceries of a self-deluded visionary, or the decrees of a self-created despot." *Tracts by Warburton and a Warburtonian*, pp. 193—94. In the very year, in which these observations on Dr Leland's literary character were given to the public, three volumes of his Sermons issued from the Dublin press; and, though posthumous, and consequently not touched by the finishing hand of the author, they exhibit a specimen of pulpit eloquence, not unworthy of the Translator of Demosthenes and the Historian of Ireland. To these Sermons there is prefixed a brief, but interesting and well-written life of the author, from which it appears, that the amount of his literary productions exceeded what have been here enumerated. The extract which I have made from the *Tracts*, although I do not accede to its justice in every particular, being disposed to attribute somewhat less to the *Translation of Demosthenes*, and a vast deal more to the *History of Ireland*, yet I could not deny myself the gratification of noticing, in connection with the name of Leland; not only as being highly creditable to the memory of a distinguished member of the University with which I am myself so closely connected, but as supplying one of the few instances, in which a provincial writer of this part of the empire has obtained due honour in the sister country. In concluding this long note, which has been almost exclusively dedicated to Dr Leland, I cannot forbear asking the question, whether it is to be ascribed to ignorance or to fraud, that, in a recent London edition of his *Translation of the Orations of Demosthenes* (viz. 1806) his designation in the title is that of Fellow of Trinity College, *Oxford?* Was the translation of the Greek orator supposed too good to have come from Ireland? or was it imagined, that the knowledge of its true origin would diminish the profit of its circulation?

[7] In reference probably to the very words in this passage it is, that our Saviour declares (Matt. xx. 28,) that he gave *τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ ϖολλῶν*, or, as Saint Paul afterwards expresses it, (1 Tim. ii. 6,) *ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ ϖάντων*.

No. XXVIII.—Page 14. Col. 2.

ON THE WORD ΚΑΤΑΛΛΑΓΗ, TRANSLATED "ATONEMENT," IN ROM. V. 11.

The word καταλλαγὴ, which is here translated "atonement," it is remarked by Sykes, (*On Redemp.* pp. 56, 201) and H. Taylor, (*B. Mord.* p. 807) and others who oppose the received doctrine of the atonement, should not have been so rendered, but should have been translated "reconciliation." The justice of this remark I do not scruple to admit. The use of the verb and participle in the former verse seems to require this translation. And this being the single passage in the New Testament, in which it is so rendered, (being elsewhere uniformly translated "reconciling," or "reconciliation," (Rom. xi. 15. 2 Cor. v. 18, 19) and being no where used by the LXX in speaking of the legal atonements, and, moreover, there being an actual impropriety in the expression, "*We* have *received*[1] the *atonement*," I feel no difficulty in adopting this correction.

But whilst I agree with these writers, in the use of the word *reconciliation* in this passage, I differ from them entirely in the inference they would derive from it. Their notion of reconciliation altogether excludes the idea of propitiation and atonement, as may be seen in Number XX. p. 56; whereas by these, it is manifest, both from the reason of the thing and the express language of Scripture, that *reconciliation* is alone to be effected; as is proved in the same Number. It deserves also to be observed, that though the word *atonement* is not used in our version of the New Testament, except in the single instance already referred to, yet in the original, the same, or words derived from the same root, with that which the LXX commonly use when speaking of the legal atonement, are not unfrequently employed in treating of the death of Christ. Thus ἱλάσκομαι and ἐξιλάσκομαι, which signify "to appease, or make propitious," are almost always used by the LXX for כפר, which by translators is sometimes rendered "to make *atonement* for," and sometimes "to *reconcile:*" and in Hebrews ii. 17, we find it said of our Lord, that he was "a merciful and faithful high priest, to make reconciliation for (εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι) the sins of the people;" and, again, he is twice, in 1 John, entitled ἱλασμὸς, "a propitiation," &c., see Number XXVI. p. 60. Now, in all these, the word *atonement* might with propriety have been used; and, as the *reconciliation* which we have received through Christ was the effect of the *atonement* made for us by his death, words which denote the former simply, as (καταλλαγὴ, and words derived from the same root,) may, when applied to the sacrifice of Christ, be not unfitly expressed by the latter, as containing in them its full import.

No. XXIX.—Page 14. Col. 2.

ON THE DENIAL THAT CHRIST'S DEATH IS DESCRIBED IN SCRIPTURE AS A SIN-OFFERING.

I have, in the page here referred to, adopted the very words of Dr Priestley himself. (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 123.) Dr Priestley, however, is far from admitting the death of Christ to be of the nature of a *sin-offering.* That it is but compared in figure to that species of sacrifice, is all that he thinks proper to concede. H. Taylor (*Ben. Mord.* pp. 811—821) contends strenuously, and certainly with as much ingenuity as the case will admit, in support of the same point. What has been urged, in Number XXVII. upon this head, will, however, I trust, be found sufficient. At all events, it furnishes a direct reply to an argument used by the former of these writers, (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. pp. 128, 129) in which, for the purpose of proving that the "death of Christ was no proper sacrifice for sin, or the antitype of the Jewish sacrifices," he maintains, that, "though the death of Christ is frequently mentioned or alluded to by the Prophets, it is never spoken of as a *sin-offering:*" and, to establish this position, he relies principally on his interpretation of Isai. liii. 10, which has been fully examined and refuted in the aforementioned Number.

In addition to what has been advanced, in that Number, upon the other text discussed in it, namely, 2 Cor. v. 21, I wish here to notice the observations of Dr Macknight and Rosenmüller. The note of the former upon it is this: "'Ἁμαρτίαν, *a sin-offering.* There are many passages in the Old Testament, where ἁμαρτία, *sin,* signifies *a sin-offering,* Hosea, iv. 8. 'They (the priests) eat up the sins (that is, the sin-offerings) of my people.' In the New Testament, likewise, the word *sin* hath the same signification, Heb. ix. 26, 28; xiii. 11." To the same purport, but more at large, Pilkington, in his *Remarks*, &c. pp. 163, 164. Rosenmüller observes as follows:—"'Ἁμαρτία, victima pro peccato, ut Hebr. אשם Levit. vii. 2, חטאה et חטאת, quod sæpe elliptice ponitur pro זבח חטאת, ut Ps. xl. 7. Exod. xxix. 14, pro quo LXX usurpant περὶ ἁμαρτίας, sc. θυσία, Levit. v. 8, 9, 11, aliisque locis. Aliis abstractum est pro concreto, et subaudiendum est ὥστε, pro: ὡς ἁμαρτάνοντα ἐποίησε, tractavit eum ut peccatorem; se gessit erga eum, uti erga peccatorem. Sensus est idem."

---

[1] It will be worth the while of those commentators, who contend (as we have noticed in Number XX.) that the reconciliation spoken of in the New Testament means only our being reconciled to God, or laying aside our enmity against him,—to consider, in what sense we are said, in this passage, to have *received* the reconciliation. What rules of language can they adopt, who talk of a man's receiving the laying aside of his own enmities?

No. XXX.—Page 14. Col. 2.

ON THE SENSE IN WHICH CHRIST IS SAID IN SCRIPTURE TO HAVE DIED FOR US.

Dr Priestley's remarks on this subject deserve to be attended to, as they furnish a striking specimen of the metaphysical ingenuity, with which the rational expositors of the present day are able to extricate themselves from the shackles of Scripture language. Christ being frequently said in Scripture to have "*died for us*," he tells us that this is to be interpreted,—dying "on our account," or "for our benefit." "Or if," he adds, "when rigorously interpreted, it should be found, that, if Christ had not died, we must have died, it is still however only consequentially so, and by no means properly and directly so, as a substitute for us: for if, in consequence of Christ's not having been sent to instruct and reform the world, mankind had continued unreformed; and the necessary consequence of Christ's coming was his death, by whatever means, and in whatever manner it was brought about; it is plain that there was, in fact, no other alternative but his death or ours: how natural, then, was it, especially to writers accustomed to the strong figurative expression of the East, to say that he died *in our stead*, without meaning it in a strict and proper sense!" *Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 199.

Here then we see, that, had the sacred writers every where represented Christ as dying *in our stead*, yet it would have amounted to no more than dying *on our account*, or *for our benefit*, just as under the present form of expression. And thus Dr Priestley has proved to us that no form of expression whatever would be proof against the species of criticism which he has thought proper to employ: for it must be remembered, that the want of this very phrase,—"*dying in our stead*," has been urged as a main argument against the notion of a strict propitiatory sacrifice in the death of Christ. To attempt to prove, then, in opposition to those who use this argument, that, when Christ is said in Scripture to have died for us, it is meant that he died instead of us, must be, in this writer's opinion, a waste of time; since, when this is accomplished, we are, in his judgment, only where we set out. As, however, there have been some who, not possessing Dr Priestley's metaphysical powers, have thought this acceptation of the word *for*, conclusive in favour of the received doctrine of atonement, and have therefore taken much pains to oppose it, I will hope to be excused, if I deem it necessary to reply to these writers.

Dr Sykes, in his *Essay on Redemption*, and H. Taylor, in his *Ben. Mord.* pp. 786, 787, have most minutely examined all the passages, in the New Testament, in which the preposition *for* is introduced. And the result of their examination is, that, in all those passages which speak of Christ as having given himself *for* us, *for* our sins, having died *for* us, &c. the word *for* must be considered as *on account of*, *for the benefit of*, and not *instead of*. The ground on which this conclusion is founded, as stated by the latter, is this; that "if the true doctrine be, that these things were done *upon our account*, or *for our advantage*, the word *for* will have the same sense in all the texts: but if the true doctrine be, that they were done *instead of*, the sense of the word will not be the same in the different texts." But surely this furnishes no good reason for deciding in favour of the former doctrine. The word *for*, or the Greek words ἀντὶ, ὑπὲρ, διὰ, περὶ, of which it is the translation, admitting of different senses, may of course be differently applied, according to the nature of the subject, and yet the doctrine remain unchanged. Thus it might be perfectly proper to say, that Christ suffered *instead of us*, although it would be absurd to say, that he suffered *instead of our offences*. It is sufficient if the different applications of the word carry a consistent meaning. To die *instead of us*, and to die *on account of our offences*, perfectly agree. But this change of the expression necessarily arises from the change of the subject. And, accordingly, the same difficulty will be found to attach to the exposition proposed by these writers: since the word *for*, interpreted *on accouut of*, i. e. *for the benefit of*, cannot be applied in the same sense in all the texts. For, although dying *for our benefit* is perfectly intelligible, dying *for the benefit of our offences* is no less absurd than dying *instead of our offences*.

The only inference that could with justice have been drawn by these writers is, that the word *for*, does not necessarily imply substitution in all these passages, and that, therefore, it is not sufficient to lay a ground for the doctrine, which implies that substitution. But that, on the other hand, it is evident that it does not imply it in any, can by no means be contended: the word ὑπὲρ, being admitted to have that force frequently in its common application; as may be seen in *Plato Conviv.* p. 1197, and again, 1178, where ἀποθνήσκειν ὑπὲρ is manifestly used for dying in stead, or place of another. That the Greeks were accustomed by this expression to imply a vicarious death, Raphelius on Rom. v. 8, directly asserts; and he produces several indisputable instances from Xenophon, in which ὑπὲρ and ἀντὶ have the force of substitution.[1] In like manner, (2 Sam. xviii. 33) when David saith concerning Absalom, τίς δώη τὸν θάνατόν μου ἀντὶ σοῦ; there is clearly expressed David's wish, that his death had gone *instead* of Absalom's.

But, indeed, this force of the word neither can be, nor is, denied by the writers alluded to. The actual application of the term, then, in the several passages in which Christ is said to have died for us, to have suffered for us, &c. is to be decided by the general language of Scripture upon that subject. And if it appears, from its uniform tenor, that Christ submitted himself to suffering and death, that thereby we might be saved from undergoing the punishment of our transgressions, will it not follow, that Christ's suffering stood in the place of ours, even though it might not be of the same nature, in any respect, with that which we were to have undergone?

No. XXXI.—Page 14. Col. 2.

ON THE PRETENCE OF FIGURATIVE ALLUSION IN THE SACRIFICIAL TERMS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

On the whole of this pretence of figurative applications, whereby H. Taylor, (*B. Mord.*) Dr Priestley, and others, endeavour to escape from the plain language of Scripture, it may be worth while to notice a distinction which has been judiciously suggested upon this subject, by Mr Veysie. (*Bampt. Lecture*, Sermon 5.)—Figurative language, he says, does not arise from the real nature of the thing to which it is transferred, but only from the imagination of him who transfers it. Thus, a man who possesses the quality of courage in an eminent degree, is figuratively called a *lion;* not because the real nature of a lion belongs to him, but because the quality which characterizes this animal is possessed by him in an eminent degree: therefore the imagination conceives them as partakers of one common nature, and applies to them one common name. Now, to suppose that language, if it cannot be literally interpreted, must necessarily be of the figurative kind here described, that is, applied only by way of allusion, is erroneous; since there is also a species of language, usually called analogical, which, though not strictly proper, is far from being merely figurative; the terms being transferred from one thing to another, not because the things are similar; but because they are in similar relations. And the term thus transferred, he contends, is as truly significant of the real nature of the thing in the relation in which it stands, as it could be were it the primitive and proper word. With this species of language, he observes, Scripture abounds.

And, indeed, so it must; for if the one dispensation was really intended to be preparatory to the other, the parallelism of their parts, or their several analogies, must have been such as necessarily to introduce the terms of the one into the explanation of the other.—Of this Mr Veysie gives numerous instances. I shall only adduce that which immediately applies to the case before us; namely, that of "the death of Christ being called, in the New Testament, a *sacrifice* and *sin-offering*." "This," says he, "is not, as the Socinian hypothesis asserts, figuratively, or merely in allusion to the Jewish sacrifices, but analogically, because the death of Christ is to the Christian Church, what the sacrifices for sin were to the worshippers of the tabernacle:" (or, perhaps, it might be more correctly expressed, because the sacrifices for sin were so appointed, that they should be to the worshippers of the tabernacle, what it had been ordained the death of Christ was to be to the Christian Church:) "And, accordingly, the language of the New Testament does not contain mere figurative allusions to the Jewish sacrifices, but ascribes a real and immediate efficacy to Christ's death, an efficacy corresponding to that which was anciently produced by the legal sin-offerings." This view of the matter will, I apprehend, be found to convey a complete answer to all that has been said upon this subject, concerning figure, allusion, &c.

---

[1] Raphelius's observations upon this subject are so valuable, that I apprehend his entire note will be acceptable to the critical reader.—"Rom. v. 8. Ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανι—id est, ἀντὶ, *loco, vice nostrâ mortuus est*, ut nos mortis pœna liberaremur. *Vicariam* enim mortem hoc loquendi genere Græci declarant. Neque Socinianis, qui secus interpretantur, quenquam ex Græcis credo assensorem esse. Nostræ sententiæ Xenophon adstipulatur. Nam cum Seuthes puerum formosum bello captum occidere vellet, Episthenes autem, puerorum amator, se pro illius morte deprecatorem præberet, rogat Seuthes Episthenem: Ἦ καὶ ἐθέλοις ἂν, ὦ Ἐπίσθενις, ὙΠΕΡ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ἈΠΟΘΑΝΕΙΝ; Vellesne, mi Episthenes, *pro hoc mori?* Cumque is nihil dubitaret pro pueri vita cervicem præbere, Seuthes vicissim puerum interrogat, εἰ παίσειεν αὐτὸν ἈΝΤΙ ἐκείνου; num hunc feriri *pro se* vellet? *De Exped. Cyri*, &c.—Et *Hist. Græc.* &c. Προειπὼν δὲ ὁ Ἀγησίλαος ὅστις παρέχοιτο ἵππον καὶ ὅπλα καὶ ἄνδρα δόκιμον, ὅτι ἐξέστι αὐτῷ μὴ στρατεύεσθαι, ἐποίησεν οὕτω ταῦτα συντόμως πράττεσθαι, ὥσπερ ἄν τις τὸν ὙΠΕΡ ΑΥΤΟΥ ἈΠΟΘΑΝΟΥΜΕΝΟΝ προθύμως ζητοίη. Quumque Agesilaus denunciasset fore, ut, quicunque daret equum et arma et peritum hominem, immunis esset a militiâ: effecit, ut hæc non aliter magna celeritate facerent, atque si quis alacriter aliquem *suo loco* moriturum quæreret.—*De Venat.* p. 768. Ἀντίλοχος τοῦ πατρὸς ὙΠΕΡΑΠΟΘΑΝΩΝ, τοσαύτης ἔτυχεν εὐκλείας, ὥστε μόνος φιλοπάτωρ παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἀναγορευθῆναι. Antilochus *pro patre* morti sese objiciens, tantum gloriæ consecutus est, ut solus apud Græcos amans patris appelletur.—Et quid opus est aliis exemplis? cum luculentissimum sit, Joh. xi. 50, ubi mortuus dicitur Salvator ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ. Quod quale sit, mox exponitur, ἵνα μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται. Raphelii *Annot.* tom. ii. pp. 253, 254.

How forcibly the word ὑπὲρ is felt to imply *substitution*, is indirectly admitted in the strongest manner even by Unitarians themselves: the satisfaction manifested by commentators of that description, whenever they can escape from the emphatical bearing of this preposition, is strikingly evinced in their late *Version of the New Testament.* See their observations on Gal. i. 4.

Indeed, some distinction of this nature is absolutely necessary. For, under the pretence of figure, we find those writers, who would reject the doctrine of atonement, endeavour to evade the force of texts of Scripture, the plainest and most positive. — Thus, Dr Priestley (*Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 214,) asserts, that the death of Christ may be called a sacrifice for sin, and a ransom; and also, that Christ may in general be said to have died in our stead, and to have borne our sins; and that figurative language even stronger than this may be used by persons who do not consider the death of Christ as having any immediate relation to the forgiveness of sins, but believe only, that it was a necessary circumstance in the scheme of the Gospel, and that this scheme was necessary to reform the world. That, however, there are parts of Scripture which have proved too powerful even for the figurative solutions of the historian of the Corruptions of Christianity, may be inferred from this remarkable concession. "In this, then, let us acquiesce, not doubting but that, though not perhaps at present, we shall in time be able, without any effort or straining, to explain all particular expressions in the apostolical epistles," &c.—(*Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 279.) Here is a plain confession on the part of Dr Priestley, that those enlightened theories, in which he and his followers exult so highly, are wrought out of Scripture only by effort and straining; and that all the powers of this polemic Procrustes have been exerted to adjust the apostolic stature to certain pre-ordained dimensions, and in some cases exerted in vain.

The reader is requested to compare what has been here said, with what has been already noticed in Numbers I. and XIV., on the treatment given to the authority of Scripture by Dr Priestley and his Unitarian fellow-labourers.

No. XXXII.—Page 14. Col. 2.

ARGUMENTS TO PROVE THE SACRIFICIAL LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT FIGURATIVE, URGED BY H. TAYLOR AND DR PRIESTLEY.

The several arguments enumerated in the page referred to are urged at large, and with the utmost force of which they are capable, in the 7th Letter of *Ben. Mordecai's Apology*, by H. Taylor. Dr Priestley has also endeavoured to establish the same point, and by arguments not much dissimilar. *Theol. Rep.* vol. i. pp. 121—136.

No. XXXIII.—Page 14. Col. 2.

ON THE SENSE ENTERTAINED GENERALLY BY ALL, AND MORE ESPECIALLY INSTANCED AMONGST THE JEWS, OF THE NECESSITY OF PROPITIATORY EXPIATION.

The last of the three arguments here referred to is urged by H. Taylor (*Ben. Mord.* pp. 784, 785, 797,) as applied particularly to the notion of *vicarious* sacrifice; but it is clear from the whole course of his reasoning, that he means it to apply to all sacrifice, of a nature properly *expiatory;* that is, to all sacrifice in which, by the suffering and death of the victim, the displeasure of God was averted from the person for whom it was offered, and the punishment due to his offence remitted, whether the suffering of the victim was supposed to be strictly of a *vicarious* nature or not.

Such a notion of sacrifice applied to the death of Christ, this writer ascribes to the engrafting of heathenish notions on Jewish customs; whereby the language of the Jews came to be interpreted by the customs and ceremonies of the heathen philosophers who had been converted to Christianity. Whether this notion be well founded, will appear from the examination of the origin of sacrifice, in the second of these Discourses, and from some of the explanatory dissertations connected with it. But it is curious to remark how Dr Priestley and this author, whilst they agree in the result, differ in their means of arriving at it. This author traces the notion of sacrifice, strictly *expiatory*, to heathen interpretation. Dr Priestley, on the contrary, asserts, that the heathens had no idea whatever of such sacrifice. He employs almost one entire essay in the *Theological Repository* (vol. i. p. 400, &c.) in the proof, that in no nation, ancient or modern, has such an idea ever existed; and as we have already seen in Number V. he pronounces it to be the unquestionable result of an historical examination of this subject, that all, whether Jews or heathens, ancient or modern, learned or unlearned, have been "equally strangers to the notion of expiatory sacrifice; equally destitute of any thing like a doctrine of proper atonement." To pass over, at present, this gross contradiction to all the records of antiquity, how shall we reconcile this gentleman to the other? or, which is of greater importance, how shall we reconcile him to himself? For, whilst in this place he maintains, that neither ancient nor modern Jews ever conceived an idea of expiatory sacrifice, he contends in another, (ibid. p. 426,) that this notion has arisen from the circumstance, of the simple religion of Christ having been "intrusted to such vessels as were the apostles:" "for," adds he, "the apostles were Jews, and had to do with Jews, and consequently represented Christianity in a Jewish dress,"—and this more particularly, "in the business of sacrifices." Now, if the Jews had no notion whatever of expiatory sacrifice, it remains to be accounted for, how the clothing the Christian doctrine of redemption in a Jewish dress, could have led to this notion. It is true, he adds, that over the Jewish disguise, which had been thrown on this doctrine by the apostles, another was drawn by Christians. But if the Jewish dress bore no relation to a doctrine of atonement, then the Christian disguise is the only one. And thus the Christians have deliberately, without any foundation laid for them, either by heathens or Jews, superinduced the notion of an expiatory sacrifice upon the simple doctrines of the Gospel: converting figurative language into a literal exposition of what was known never to have had a real existence!

To leave, however, this region of contradictions, it may not be unimportant to inquire into the facts which have been here alleged by Dr Priestley. And it must be allowed, that he has crowded into this one essay as many assertions at variance with received opinion, as can easily be found comprised in the same compass, on any subject whatever. He has asserted, that no trace of any scheme of atonement, or of any requisite for forgiveness, save repentance and reformation, is to be discovered either in the book of Job, or in the Scriptures of the ancient, or any writings of the modern Jews; or amongst the heathen world, either ancient or modern. These assertions, as they relate to Job, and the religion of the heathens, have been already examined; the former in Number XXIII. the latter in Number V. An inquiry into his position, as it affects the Jews, with some farther particulars concerning the practices of the heathen, will fully satisfy us as to the degree of reliance to be placed on this writer's historical exactness.

With respect to the sentiments of the ancient Jews, or, in other words, the sense of the Old Testament upon the subject, that being the main question discussed in these Discourses, especially in the second, no inquiry is in this place necessary: it will suffice at present to examine the writings of the Jews of later times; and we shall find that these give the most direct contradiction to his assertions. He has quoted Maimonides, Nachmanides, Abarbanel, Buxtorf, and Isaac Netto, and concludes, with confidence, that among the modern Jews no notion has ever existed "of any kind of mediation being necessary to reconcile the claims of justice with those of mercy;" or, as he elsewhere expresses it, of "any satisfaction beside repentance being necessary to the forgiveness of sin." (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. pp. 409—411.) Now, in direct opposition to this, it is notorious, that the stated confession made by the Jews, in offering up the victim in sacrifice, concludes with these words, "Let this (the victim) be my expiation."[1] And this the Jewish writers directly interpret as meaning, "Let the evils, which in justice should have fallen on my head, light upon the head of the victim which I now offer." Thus Baal Aruch says, "That wherever the expression, 'Let me be another's expiation,' is used, it is the same as if it had been said, 'Let me be put in his room, that I may bear his guilt;' and this, again, is equivalent to saying, 'Let this act, whereby I take on me his transgression, obtain for him his pardon.'" In like manner, Solomon Jarchi (*Sanhedr.* ch. 2,) says, "'Let us be your expiation,' signifies, 'Let us be put in your place, that the evil, which should have fallen upon you, may all light on us:'" and in the same way Obadias de Bartenora, and other learned Jews, explain this formula.

Again, respecting the burnt-offerings, and sacrifices for sin, Nachmanides, on Levit. i. says, that "it was right that the offerer's own blood should be shed, and his body burnt: but that the Creator, in his mercy, hath accepted this victim from him, as a *vicarious substitute* (תמורה,) and an *atonement* (כפר,) that its blood should be poured out *instead* of his blood, and its life stand *in place* of his life." R. Bechai also, on Lev. i. uses the very same language. Isaac Ben Arama, on Leviticus, likewise says, that "the offender, when he beholds the victim, on account of his sin, slain, skinned, cut in pieces, and burnt with fire upon the altar, should reflect, that thus he must have been treated, had not God in his clemency accepted this *expiation* for his life." David de Pomis, in like manner, pronounces the victim the *vicarious substitute* (תמורה) for the offerer. And Isaac Abarbanel, affirms, in his preface to Levit. that "the offerer deserved that his blood should be poured out, and his body burnt for his sins; but that God, in his clemency, accepted from him the victim as his *vicarious substitute* (תמורה), and *expiation* (כפר), whose blood was poured out *in place* of his blood, and its life given *in lieu* of his life."

I should weary the reader and myself, were I to adduce all the authorities on this point. Many more may be found in Outram *de Sacrificiis*, pp. 251—259. These, however, will probably satisfy most readers, as to the fairness of the representation which Dr Priestley has given of the notion entertained by modern Jews concerning the doctrine of atonement, and of their total ignorance of any satisfaction for sin, save only repentance and amendment. One thing there is in this review, that cannot but strike the reader, as it did me, with surprise; which is this,—that of the three writers of eminence among the Jewish Rabbis, whom Dr Priestley has named, Maimonides, Abarbanel, and Nachmanides, the two last, as is manifest from the passages already cited, maintain in direct terms the strict notion of atonement: and though Maimonides has not made use of language equally explicit, yet on due examination it will appear, that he supplies a testimony by no means inconsistent with that notion. Dr Priestley's method of managing the testimonies furnished by these writers will throw considerable light upon his mode of reasoning from ancient authors in support of his favourite theories. It will not then be time misemployed, to follow him somewhat more minutely through his examination of them.

---

[1] See the form of confession in Maim. *de Cult. Divin. de Veil.* pp. 152, 153.

He begins with stating, that Maimonides considered sacrifice to be merely a heathen ceremony, adopted by the Divine Being in his own worship, for the gradual abolition of idolatry. This opinion, he says, was opposed by R. Nachmanides, and defended by Abarbanel, who explains the nature of sacrifice, as offered by Adam and his children, in this manner:—viz. "They burned the fat and the kidneys of the victims upon the altar, for their own inwards, being the seat" (not as it is erroneously given in *Theol. Rep.* as the *seal*) "of their intentions and purposes; and the legs of the victims for their own hands and feet; and they sprinkled their blood, instead of their own blood and life; confessing that in the sight of God, the just Judge of things, the blood of the offerers should be shed, and their bodies burnt for their sins — but that, through the mercy of God, expiation was made for them by the victim being put in their place, by whose blood and life, the blood and life of the offerers were redeemed." (*Exordium Comment. in Levit. de Veil.* pp. 291, 292.) Now it deserves to be noted, that Sykes, whose assistance Dr Priestley has found of no small use in his attempts upon the received doctrine of atonement, deemed the testimony of this Jewish writer, conveyed in the above form of expression, so decisive, that without hesitation he pronounces him to have held the notion of a vicarious substitute, in the strictest acceptation (*Essay on Sacrifices*, pp. 121, 122;) and, that the sense of the Jewish Rabbis at large is uniformly in favour of atonement by strict vicarious substitution, he feels himself compelled to admit, by the overbearing force of their own declarations, although his argument would have derived much strength from an opposite conclusion. (*Ibid.* pp. 149, 150, 157, 158.) The same admission is made by the author of the *Scripture Account of Sacrifices*, (*Append.* pp. 17, 18) notwithstanding that it is equally repugnant to the principles of his theory. But, after stating the passage last quoted at full length, what is Dr Priestley's remark? — That "all this is evidently figurative, the act of sacrificing being represented as emblematical of the sentiments and language of the offerer." And the argument by which he establishes this is, that "this writer could never think that an animal could make proper satisfaction for sin," &c. What then is Dr Priestley's argument?—The modern Jews have never entertained an idea of any expiation for sin save repentance only; for we are told by Abarbanel, that "expiation was made for the offerer by the victim being put in his place;" and by this he did not mean that the animal made expiation for the sin of the sacrificer, because he could never think that an animal could make satisfaction for sin! Now might not this demonstration have been abridged to much advantage, and without endangering in any degree the force of the proof, by putting it in this manner? — Abarbanel did hold, that by the sacrifice of an animal no expiation could be made for sin, for it is impossible that he could have thought otherwise.

Complete as this proof is in itself, Dr Priestley however does not refuse us still farther confirmation of his interpretation of this writer's testimony. He tells us, "that he repeats the observation already quoted from him, in a more particular account of sacrifices for sins committed through ignorance, such as casual uncleanness, &c. in which no proper guilt could be contracted:" and that he also "considers sin-offerings as fines, or mulcts, by way of admonitions not to offend again," (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 410.) Now, as to the former of these assertions, it is to be noted, that Abarbanel, in the passage referred to, is speaking of an error of the High Priest, which might be attended with the most fatal consequences by misleading the people, perhaps in some of the most essential points of their religion. And as the want of sufficient knowledge, or of due consideration, in him who was to expound the law, and to direct the people to what was right, must be considered as a degree of audacity highly criminal, for which, he says, the offender deserved to be punished with death, ignorance not being admissible in such a case as an excuse, therefore it was, that the sin-offering was required of him, "the mercy of God accepting the sacrifice of the animal in his stead, and appointing that in offering he should place his hands on the animal, to remind him that the victim was received as his (תמורה) vicarious substitute." De Veil. *Exord*, pp. 313—317.) "For the same reasons," he says, (p. 317) "the same method was to be observed in the sin-offering of the Sanhedrim;" and he adds also, (p. 325) that "in the case of an error committed by a private person, whereby he had fallen into any idolatrous practice, the sin-offering appointed for him was to be of the same nature exactly, and the animal offered the same, as in the case of a similar error in the High Priest or the Prince: and for this reason, that although in all other offences the criminality of the High Priest or Prince exceeded that of a private individual, yet in this all were equal; for the unity of the true God having been proclaimed to all the people, at Sinai, no one was excusable in his ignorance of this fundamental truth." [2]

Thus the crimes of ignorance, of which this writer speaks in the passages referred to, are evidently not of the nature represented by Dr Priestley, namely, casual and accidental lapses, in which no proper guilt could be contracted: and consequently his argument, which from the application of the same form of sacrifice to these cases as to those in which guilt did exist, would infer, that in none was it the intention by the sacrifice to make expiation for transgression, must necessarily fall to the ground. Had Dr Priestley, however, taken the pains to make himself better acquainted with the works of the writer, whose authority he has cited in support of his opinion, he would never have risked the observations just now alluded to. He would have found, that, in the opinion of this, as well as of every other, Jewish writer of eminence, even those cases of defilement which were involuntary, such as leprosy, child-bearing, &c. uniformly implied an idea of guilt. Thus Abarbanel, speaking of the case of puerpery in the 12th chapter of Leviticus, says, that "without committing sin no one is ever exposed to suffering; that it is a principle with the Jewish Doctors, 'that there is no pain without crime,' and that, therefore, the woman who had endured the pains of childbirth was required to offer a piacular sacrifice." And again, on the case of the Leper in the 14th chapter of Leviticus, the same writer remarks, that the sin-offering was enjoined, "because that the whole of the Mosaic religion being founded on this principle, that whatever befalls any human creature is the result of providential appointment, the leper must consider his malady as a judicial infliction for some transgression." And this principle is so far extended by Maimonides, (*Moreh Nevochim*, p. 380) as to pronounce, that "even a pain so slight as that of a thorn wounding the hand, and instantly extracted, must be ranked as a penal infliction by the Deity for some offence:" see also Clavering *Annot. in Maim. De Pœnitentia*, pp. 141, 142. Other Jewish writers carry this matter farther. Thus R. Bechai, on Levit. vii. 7, says, that "the woman after childbirth is bound to bring a sin-offering, in expiation of that original taint, derived from the common mother of mankind, by whose transgression it was caused that the procreation of the species was not like the production of the fruits of the earth, spontaneous and unmixed with sensual feelings."

Whether these opinions of the Jewish Rabbis be absurd or otherwise, is a point with which I have no concern. The fact, that such were their opinions, is all I contend for. And this I think will satisfy us respecting the competency of Dr Priestley as an interpreter of their writings; when we find him thus arguing from the actual impossibility that they could hold an opinion, which they themselves expressly assert they did hold; and when we find him maintaining the rectitude of his theory by their testimony, whilst he explains their testimony by the unquestionable rectitude of his theory. This is a species of logic, and a mode of supplying authorities from ancient writers, in which Dr Priestley has been long exercised; as may abundantly appear, not only from several parts of these illustrations, but from the collection of very able and useful Tracts published by the late Bishop Horsley.

A few words more concerning the Rabbis. —Dr Priestley endeavours to insinuate, as we have seen, p. 71, that "Abarbanel considers sin-offerings as fines or mulcts, by way of admonition not to offend again." Now, whoever will take the trouble of consulting that writer himself, will find, that this subordinate end of sacrifice is mentioned by him, only in connection with offences of the slightest kind, and amounting, at the most, to the want of a sufficient caution in guarding against the possibility of accidental defilement. When this want of caution has been on occasions and in stations so important, as to render it a high crime and capital offence, as in the case of the High Priest, the expression used is, that the offender deserves to be mulcted with death, but that the victim is accepted in his stead, &c. (De Veil. *Abarb. Exord.* pp. 313. 315.) Whether, then, the sin-offering was intended to be considered by this writer merely as a fine, the reader will judge. Indeed Dr Priestley himself has already proved that it was not; inasmuch as he has asserted that he has represented sacrifices for sin as emblematical actions. Now if they were solely emblematical actions, they could not have been fines: and if they were solely fines, they could not have been emblematical actions. But if the author, whilst he represented them as fines, considered them likewise as emblematical actions, then the circumstance of his having viewed them in the light of fines, is no proof that he might not likewise have considered them as strictly propitiatory. The introduction, therefore, of this remark by Dr Priestley, is either superfluous or sophistical.

---

[2] Maimonides gives the same account of this matter.—See Maim. *de Sacrif. De Veil.* p. 116; also, *Moreh Nevochim*, pp. 464, 465.

The observations applied to Abarbanel extend with equal force to the opinions of Maimonides: for the former expressly asserts more than once, (*Exord. Comment. in Levit.* pp. 231, 235) that he but repeats the sentiments of the latter, on the import of the sacrificial rites. Nor will the assertion of Maimonides, (which has been much relied on by Sykes,) viz. that "repentance expiates all transgressions," invalidate in any degree what has been here urged; for it is evident, that, in the treatise on Repentance, in which this position is found, he is speaking in reference to the Jewish institutions, and endeavouring to prove, from the peculiar condition of the Jews since the destruction of their temple, that repentance is the only remaining expedient for restoration to the divine favour: "since we have no longer a temple or altar, there remains no expiation for sins, but repentance only—and this will expiate all transgressions." (Maim. *De Pœnit.* Clavering, p. 45.) And with a view to the proving its sufficiency, (now that sacrifice was no longer possible, and to prevent the Jews, who had been used to attribute to the sacrifice the principal efficacy in their reconciliation with God, from thinking lightly of that only species of homage and obedience which now remained,) it seems to be that both here, and in his *Moreh Nevochim*, (p. 435) he endeavours to represent prayer and confession of sins, as at all times constituting a main part of the sacrificial service. But this by no means proves, that the sacrifice was not in his opinion expiatory; on the contrary it clearly manifests his belief that it was; since it is only because it was no longer possible for the Jews according to the Mosaic ordinances, that he considers it as laid aside: for if repentance and prayer were in themselves perfectly sufficient, then the reason assigned for the cessation of sacrifice, and the efficacy of repentance *per se* under the existing circumstances, would have been unmeaning.

But this writer's notion of the efficacy of repentance, and of the ceremonial rites, may be still better understood from the following remarks. Speaking of the scape goat, he says, (*Moreh Nevochim*, p. 404,) that "it was believed to pollute those that touched it, on account of the multitude of sins which it carried:" and of this goat he says again, (*De Pœnit.* pp. 44, 45,) that "it expiated all the sins recounted in the law, of whatever kind, with regard to him who had repented of those sins; but that with respect to him who had not repented, it expiated only those of a lighter sort:" and those sins of a lighter sort, he defines to be all those transgressions of the law against which excision is not denounced. So that, according to this writer, there were cases, and those not a few, in which repentance was not necessary to expiation. And again, that it was not in itself sufficient for expiation, he clearly admits, not only from his general notion of sacrifices throughout his works, but from his express declarations on this subject. He says, that with respect to certain offences, "neither repentance, nor the day of expiation" (which he places on the same ground with repentance as to its expiatory virtue,) "have their expiatory effect, unless chastisement be inflicted to *perfect the expiation*." And in one case, he adds, that "neither repentance followed by uniform obedience, nor the day of expiation, nor the chastisement inflicted, can effect the expiation, nor can the expiation be completed but by the death of the offender." (*De Pœnit.* pp. 46, 47.)

The reader may now be able to form a judgment, whether the doctrines of the Jewish Rabbis really support Dr Priestley's position,—that amongst the modern Jews no notion of any scheme of sacrificial atonement, or of any requisite for forgiveness, save repentance and reformation, has been found to have had existence. And I must again remind him of the way in which the authorities of the Jewish writers have been managed by Dr Priestley, so as to draw from them a testimony apparently in his favour. The whole tribe of Rabbinical authors, who have, as we have seen, in the most explicit terms avowed the doctrine of atonement, in the strictest sense of the word, are passed over without mention, save only Nachmanides, who is but transiently named, whilst his declarations on this subject, being directly adverse, are totally suppressed. Maimonides and Abarbanel, indeed, are adduced in evidence, but how little to Dr Priestley's purpose, and in how mutilated and partial a shape I have endeavoured to evince. These writers, standing in the foremost rank of the Rabbinical teachers, as learned and liberal expositors of the Jewish law, could not but feel the futility of the sacrificial system, unexplained by that great sacrifice, which, as Jews, they must necessarily have rejected. Hence arises their theory of the human origin of sacrifice, and hence their occasional seeming departure from the principles of the sacrificial worship, maintained by other Rabbis, and adopted also by themselves, in the general course of their writings. From these parts of their works, which seem to be no more than philosophical struggles to colour to the eye of reason the inconsistencies of an existing doctrine, has Dr Priestley sought support for an assertion which is in open contradiction, not only to the testimony of every other Rabbinical writer, but to the express language of these very writers themselves.

But Dr Priestley is not contented with forcing upon these more remote authors a language which they never used, but he endeavours also to extract from those of later date a testimony to the same purpose, in direct opposition to their own explicit assertions. Thus, in Buxtorf's account of the ceremony observed by the modern Jews of killing a cock on the preparation for the day of expiation, he thinks he finds additional support for his position, that, amongst the modern Jews, no idea of a strict propitiatory atonement has been known to exist. Now, as to Dr Priestley's representation of Buxtorf, I cannot oppose a more satisfactory authority than that of Buxtorf himself, I shall quote the passage as given in that writer, and that no pretence of misrepresentation may remain, I give it untinged by the medium of a translation.

"Quilibet postea paterfamilias, cum gallo præ manibus, in medium primus prodit, et ex Psalmis Davidis ait; ‘Sedentes in tenebris,’ &c.—item, ‘Si ei adsit Angelus interpres, unus de mille, qui illi resipiscentiam exponat, tunc miserebitur ejus, et dicet, *redime eum, ne descendat in fossam: inveni enim expiationem*’ (gallum nempe gallinaceum, qui peccata mea expiabit.) Deinde expiationem aggreditur, et capiti suo gallum ter allidit, singulosque ictus his vocibus prosequitur, זה חליפתי זה תחתי זה כפרתי זה התרנגול ילך למיתה ואני אלך לחיים טובים עם כל ישראל אמן.—‘Hic Gallus sit *permutatio pro me*, hic *in locum meum succedat*, hic sit *expiatio pro me*, huic gallo mors afferetur, mihi vero et toti Israeli vita fortunata. Amen.’ Hoc ille ter ex ordine facit, pro se, sc. pro filiis suis, et pro peregrinis qui apud illum sunt, uti Summus Sacerdos in vet. test. expiationem quoque fecit. Gallo deinde imponens manus, ut in sacrificiis olim, eum statim mactat, cutemque ad collum ei primum contrahit et constringit, et secum reputat, se, qui præfocetur aut strangületur, dignum esse: hunc autem gallum *in suum locum substituere* et offere; cultello postea jugulum resolvit, iterum animo secum perpendens, semetipsum, qui gladio plectatur, dignum esse; et confestim illum vi e manibus in terram projicit, ut denotet, se dignum esse, bus qui lapidibus obruatur: postremo illum assat, ut hoc facto designet, se dignum esse, qui igne vitam finiat: et ita quatuor hæc mortis genera, pro Judæis gallus sustinere debet. Intestina vulgo supra domus tectum jaciunt. Alii dicunt id fieri, quia quum peccata internum quid potius quam externum sint, ideo galli intestinis peccata hærere: corvos itaque advenire, et cum Judæorum peccatis in desertum avolare debere, ut hircus in vet. test. cum populi peccatis in desertum aufugiebat. Alii aliam reddunt causam. Causa autem, cur gallo potius quam alio animante utantur, hæc est, quia vir ebraice גבר *Gebher* appellatur. Jam si *Gebher* peccaverit, *Gebher* etiam peccati *pœnam sustinere* debet.—Quia vero gravior esset pœna, quàm ut illam subire possent Judæi, gallum gallinaceum qui Talmudicâ seu Babyloniâ dialecto גבר *Gebher* appellatur, in locum suum substituunt, et ita justitiæ Dei *satisfit;* quia quum גבר *Gebher* peccaverit, גבר *Gebher* etiam, *i. e.* Gallus gallinaceus plectitur."—*Synagoga Judaica*, ed. 4, pp. 509—512.

I leave this extract, without comment, to confront Dr Priestley's representation of it; viz. that it indicates nothing of the strict notion of atonement. (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. pp. 410, 411.) He adds, indeed, for the purpose of confirming his account of this passage, that this cock is afterwards eaten; as if thence to infer, that the offerers could not consider the animal as a real substitute for them, in respect to their sins and their punishment: and yet Buxtorf expressly asserts, that when it had been the custom to distribute amongst the poor the animals slain in the manner above described, it created much murmuring; the poor recoiling with horror from the gift, saying that they were required to eat the sins of the rich: and that the rich offerers were therefore obliged to bestow their charitable donations on the poor in money, to the amount of the value of their offering; and "thus having *redeemed* the offering from God, by its equivalent in money, they then feasted upon it," (*Syn. Jud.* pp. 515, 516.) Again, Dr Priestley insinuates, that the Jews could not consider this offering as a strict expiation, because "that when they themselves die, they pray that their own deaths may be considered as an expiation or satisfaction for their sins." Dr Priestley does not recollect that the atonement made at the day of expiation extended only to the sins of the past year, and that those which were committed after that day, must remain unexpiated until the day of expiation in the succeeding year. The dying person had consequently to account for all the sins committed since the last preceding day of expiation. And as every natural ill was deemed by the Jews a penal infliction for sin, death was consequently viewed by them in the same light, and in the highest degree; and therefore it was reasonable that they should hope from it a full atonement and satisfaction for their transgressions.

Thus we see that even the authorities quoted by Dr Priestley as supporting his theories, are found to be in direct contradiction to them. And from this, and the numerous other instances of his misrepresentation of ancient writers, which may be found in the course of these remarks, we may learn a useful lesson respecting his reports of authors in those voluminous writings in which he has laboured to convert the religion of Christ into a system of heathen morality. I have, for this purpose, been thus copious on his representations of the opinions of the modern Jews; and, without dwelling longer on this point, or adverting to Isaac Netto, who happened in a "very good sermon" to speak with confidence of the mercy of God, without hinting any thing of mediation as necessary to satisfy his justice, (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 411,) I turn back to what we are told three pages before concerning Philo and Josephus.

These writers, who are nearly contemporary with our Saviour, Dr Priestley informs us, furnish no intimation whatever, in any part of their works, of "any ideas that have the least connection with those that are suggested by the modern doctrine of atonement," (pp. 408, 409 ;) and, according to his usual practice, he produces one or two insulated passages from the voluminous works of these authors to prove that their sentiments on the subjects of sacrifice, and of the divine placability, correspond with his own. Now, were it true with respect to Josephus, as Dr Priestley asserts, that he suggests no idea in any degree similar to the received notion of atonement, yet could this furnish no proof that he entertained no such idea ; because he himself expressly informs us (*Ant. Jud.* lib. iii. cap. 9, sect. 3, p. 121, and cap. 11, sect. 2, p, 125—vol. i. ed. Huds.) that he reserves the more minute examination of the nature of the animal offerings for a distinct treatise on the subject of sacrifice, which has either not been written, or has not come down to us. But although the historian, in consequence of this intention, has made but slight and incidental mention of the nature of sacrifice, yet has he said enough to disprove Dr Priestley's assertion, having in all places in which he has occasion to speak of the sin-offering, described the victim as sacrificed in *deprecation* of God's wrath, and in *supplication of pardon* for transgression. Παραίτησις ἁμαρτημάτων, is the expression he constantly employs on this subject ;[3] and, in treating of the scape-goat, he calls it ἀποτροπιασμὸς καὶ ϖαραίτησις ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτημάτων. (See p. 92, as referred to in the note below.) And as to the distinction made by this writer between the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, on the strength of which Dr Priestley ranks him as an auxiliary on the subject of this sacrificial import, it deserves to be remarked, that this, so far as it can be understood, seems not to be in any degree inconsistent with the commonly received notions of sacrifice, inasmuch as it relates rather to the sentiments of the offerers, than to the intrinsic nature of the things offered.[4]

But besides, we find in the very section in which this distinction is pointed out, an observation respecting a sacrifice offered by Cain, which, had Dr Priestley permitted his eyes to wander but a few lines from the passage he has quoted, might have convinced him that Josephus admitted, equally with the supporters of the present doctrine of atonement, the *propitiatory* virtue of sacrifice : for, having related the murder of Abel by his brother, and God's consequent resentment against Cain, he adds, that upon Cain's "offering up a sacrifice, and by virtue thereof (δὶ αὐτῆς) supplicating him not to be extreme in his wrath, God was led to remit the punishment of the murder." Thus the wrath of God was *averted* by sacrifice, and that life which, according to strict justice, was to be paid for the life which had been taken away, was preserved through virtue of the offering made. With what reason, then, upon the whole, Dr Priestley has claimed the support of Josephus's testimony, it is not difficult to judge. Whether he has had better grounds for appealing to that of Philo, remains to be considered.

This distinguished and philosophic Jew, whose resemblance to Plato, both in richness of diction and sublimity of sentiment, gave birth to the Greek proverb, ἢ Πλάτων Φιλωνίζει, ἢ Φίλων ϖλατωνίζει, has, indeed, exercised upon the Jewish doctrines an extraordinary degree of mystical refinement : he is also pronounced, by some of the highest authorities, to have been entirely ignorant both of the language and customs of the Jews, and consequently to have fallen into gross errors in his representation of the doctrines of their religion.[5] And yet from two detached passages in this author's writings, one of which is so completely irrelevant, that it were idle even to notice it, Dr Priestley does not hesitate to decide upon the notion entertained by the Jews of his day respecting the nature of sacrificial atonement. He also asserts, indeed, that in no part of his works does he suggest any idea in the slightest degree resembling the modern notion of atonement. To hazard this assertion, is to confess an entire ignorance of the writings of this author ; for, on the contrary, so congenial are his sentiments and language to those of the first Christian writers, on the subject of the corruption of man's nature, the natural insufficiency of our best works, the necessity of an intercessor, a redeemer, and ransom for sin, together with the appointment of the divine ΛΟΓΟΣ for these purposes, that the learned Bryant has been led to conclude, that he must actually have derived these doctrines from the sources of evangelical knowledge. That he had, indeed, the opportunity of doing so, from an intimate intercourse with Saint Peter, is attested by Hieronymus, (*Catalog. Scriptor. Eccles.*) Photius, (*Biblioth.* cv.) and Suidas, (*Historic.*) by whom, as well as by Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccles.* lib. ii.) it is affirmed, that the beautiful eulogium contained in this writer's treatise, Περὶ Βιου Θεωρ. was pronounced on the apostolic Christians settled at Alexandria, who were the followers of Saint Mark, the disciple of Peter. The arguments of Dr Allix, however, in his *Judgment of the Jewish Church*, &c. (p.76—83,) though they may justly be deemed invalid as to the impossibility of Philo's intercourse with the first Christians, for which he contends in opposition to the above authorities, yet seem sufficient to warrant us in pronouncing, that however similar his notions and expressions may be to those of the early Christians, they yet were not derived from Christian sources; and that, consequently, they exhibit the doctrines of the Jewish church: such, at least, as they were held by the Jews of Alexandria in his day.

---

[3] Χίμαρόν τε ἐπὶ ϖαραιτήσει ἁμαρτημάτων — Again. ἔριφον ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτάδων —and, κατὰ ϖαραίτησιν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐρίφου.—See Josephi *Opera*, *Ant. Jud.* lib. iii. pp. 90, 92, edit. Genev. 1633.

[4] See the translation by L'Estrange, p. 5, who appears to have hit on the true meaning of the original, and compare the preceding sentences, in which the characters of the two brothers are described.

[5] See Photius *Biblioth.* cv. ed. 1635 ; *Thes. Temp. Jos. Scalig. Animad.* p. 7, ed. 1658 ; and Grotius, in Matt. xxxvi. 18.

But to instance a few of the numerous passages in the works of this author of the import above alluded to:—He informs us, (Περὶ Φυτουργ. p. 217, ed. 1640,) that "man was made in the image of God"—that he was placed in a state of perfect happiness, (ibid. pp. 219, 220, and Νομ. Ἱερ. Ἀλληγ. pp. 56, 57,) but that, "having disgraced and deformed this likeness, by his fall from virtue, he likewise fell from happiness, and from an immortal state, was deservedly doomed to misery and death," (Περὶ Εὐγεν. p. 906)—that being now "naturally prone to vice," (Θει. Πραγ. Κληρ. p. 522,) and so degenerate, "that even his virtues are of no value, but through the goodness and favour of God," (Περὶ τοῦ τὸ Χειρ. p. 166)—mankind are consequently obliged "to trust to this alone for the purification of the soul, and must not imagine that they are themselves capable, without the divine favour and influence, to purge and wash away the stains which deform their nature." (Περῖ τῶν Ὀνειρ. pp. 1111, 1112.) And so great does he represent this corruption of the human mind, as to exclaim, that "no man of sound judgment, observing the actions of men, can refrain from calling aloud on the only Saviour God, to remove this burden of iniquity, and, by appointing some 'ransom and redemption for the soul,' (λύτρα καὶ σῶστρα καταθεὶς τῆς ψυχῆς,) to restore it to its original liberty." (Περὶ Συγχ. Διαλ. p. 333.) "For a race, by nature thus carried headlong to sin," he pronounces "some mode of propitiation to be necessary,"(Περὶ Φυγαδ. p. 465,)—and for this purpose, he says, "an advocate and intercessor for men" (Ἱκὲτης τοῦ θνητοῦ) has been appointed, viz. "the Divine *Logos*, that Archangel, the first born Son of God, ordained by him to stand as a 'Mediator' (Μεθόριος) between the creature and the Creator, acting as a surety to each party, (ἀμφοτέροις ὁμηρεύων,) and proclaiming peace to all the world, that through his intercession men might have a firm faith in God," (Θει, Πραγ Κληρ. p. 509)—that same Λόγος, who is also called by him "an *High Priest*, free from all sin," (Περὶ Φυγαδ. p. 466, and Περὶ τῶν Ὀνειρ. p. 597); of whose mediation he acknowledges the intercession of Aaron to have been but a type, (Περὶ Φυγαδ. p. 446, and Θει. Πραγ. Κληρ. p. 508); and whom he describes to be that "substitute and representation" of the Deity (ὕπαρχος Θεοῦ) through whom he is related in the Old Testament to have conversed with man, (Περὶ τῶν Ὀνειρ. p. 600.) And, when he speaks of that part of the law wherein it is said that the man of guilt should fly to an appointed city of refuge, and not be acquitted till the *death of the high priest*, he confesses (Περὶ Φυγαδ. pp. 465, 466) that by this the Levitical high priest cannot be literally meant, but that he must be in this case the type of one far greater; for "that the high priest alluded to is not a man, but the sacred *Logos*, who is incapable of all sin, and who is said to have his head anointed with oil:" and that the death of *this High Priest* is that which is here intended:—thus admitting the death of the *Logos*, whom he describes as the *anointed*, and allows to be typified by the Jewish high priest, to be the means of recovery from a state of spiritual bondage, and of giving liberty to the soul. It is true, he allegorizes away this meaning again, according to his usual custom. But, whilst he refines upon the doctrine, he at the same time testifies its existence in his day.

The reader will now judge, whether this writer deemed "repentance and good works sufficient for divine acceptance," or whether he entertained "any ideas resembling those that are suggested by the modern doctrine of atonement." Dr Priestley however contends, that he considered sacrifices but as gifts; and this he infers from the account given by him, of the preference of Abel's sacrifice to that of Cain: viz. that, "instead of inanimate things, he offered animate; instead of young animals, those that were grown to their full size; instead of the leanest, the fattest," &c.—— Dr Priestley should at the same time have stated, that the whole of the account given by this writer of the history of Cain and Abel, is one continued allegory: that by the birth of the two brothers, he understands "the rise of two opposite principles in the soul; one ascribing all to the natural powers of the individual, and thence represented by Cain, which signifies possession; the other referring all to God, and thence denominated Abel" (Περὶ ων Ἱερουργ. p. 130): that this latter principle he also holds to be implied in the occupation of Abel, inasmuch "as by a tender of sheep, is meant a controller of the brute powers of the soul; and that Abel, therefore, from his pious reference of all to God, is properly described as a shepherd; and Cain, on the contrary from the deriving all from his own individual exertions, is called a tiller of the ground." (*Ibid.* pp. 136, 137.) The sacrifice of Abel consequently denotes the offering of the pious and devout affections of the heart; this being "what is meant by the firstlings of the flock, and the fat thereof," (*Ibid.* pp. 137. 145. 154.) whilst that of Cain, on the other hand, represents an offering, destitute of those affections, an offering of impiety, inasmuch "as the fruits of the earth import the selfish feelings: their being offered after certain days, indicates the backwardness of the offerer; and the fruits, simply, and not the first-fruits, shew that the first honour was held back from the Creator, and given to the creature." (*Ibid.* pp. 137. 141, 142. 145.) And in this sense it is, that Abel is said by this writer, "neither to have offered the same things, nor in the same way: but instead of inanimate, things animate; instead of young and inferior animals, the matured and choicest:" in other words, that the most animated and vigorous sentiments of homage are requisite to constitute an acceptable act of devotion.

In this light the due value of Dr Priestley's quotation from this writer, as applied to the present question, may easily be estimated. But, had Dr Priestley looked to that part of this author's works, in which he treats expressly of the animals offered in sacrifice, he would have seen, that he describes the sacrifice for sin as being the appointed means of "obtaining pardon, and escaping the evil consequences of sin,"—*κακῶν ἀπαλλαγὴ* — *κακῶν φυγὴ* — *ἀμνεστίαν ἀδικημάτων αἰτεῖσθαι*: (Περὶ *Ζώων*. pp. 838. 843;) and that in the case of an injury committed, he represents the reparation made to the person injured, joined to contrition for the offence and supplication of pardon from the Deity, as not sufficient to obtain the divine forgiveness, without offering an animal in expiation, (*Ibid.* p. 844.) Had Dr Priestley, indeed, asserted that this writer's notion of sacrifice was that of a symbolical and mystical representation, he had given a fair account of the matter. For, when he informs us, that "the blood of the victim was poured in a circle round the altar, because a circle is the most perfect figure; and that the soul, which is figured by the blood, should through the entire circle of thought and action worship God:" when he tells us, that "the victim was separated into parts, to admonish us, that, in order to the true worship of the Deity, his nature must be considered and weighed in its distinct parts and separate perfections, (ibid. p. 839): it will readily be admitted, that he soars into regions, whither a plain understanding will not find it easy to follow him. But to have stated this, would not have answered the purpose of Dr Priestley's argument: because this high strain of mysticism would have clearly disqualified him as an evidence on behalf of Dr Priestley's, or of any intelligible, theory of sacrifice.

Indeed, with respect to this ancient writer, the truth seems to be,[6] that viewing the Jewish system without that light which alone could give it shape and meaning, he found it impossible to account for it on any sound principles of reason. He, therefore, made his religion bend to his philosophy, and veiled in allegory whatever would not admit a satisfactory literal solution. And this he must have found still more necessary, if what is related concerning his intercourse with the early Christians be well founded. For, in his controversies with them, the sacrificial system, which they would not fail to press upon him as requiring and receiving a full completion in the sacrifice of Christ, he would have found himself compelled to spiritualize, so as to give it a distinct and independent import.

Now, if to these considerations be added, what has been already stated, that this writer had not the means of being perfectly acquainted with the nature of the Hebrew rites, it will follow, that his testimony cannot be expected to bear strongly upon the present question. The same has been already shewn with respect to that of Josephus. So far, however, as they both do apply to the subject, instead of justifying Dr Priestley's position, they are found to make directly against it. Their silence on the subject of the vicarious import of animal sacrifice cannot, for the reasons alleged, be urged by Dr Priestley as an argument in support of that part of his system which denies the existence of that notion amongst the Jews: whilst the explicit declarations of Josephus, on the expiatory virtue of sacrifice; and those of Philo, on the necessity of *mediation* and *propitiation*, to render even our good works acceptable to a God offended at the corruption of our nature, and of some means of *ransom* and *redemption* to restore man to his lost estate, sufficiently evince the existence of those great leading principles of the doctrine of atonement, *expiation*, and *propitiation*, which Dr Priestley utterly denies to have had any place amongst the Jews in the days of these two celebrated writers.

The value of Dr Priestley's assertions concerning these writers, as well as of those respecting Jews of later date, being now sufficiently ascertained, I shall conclude this long discussion with a few remarks on the ideas entertained by the ancient heathens, with regard to the nature, and efficacy, of their sacrifices. To adduce arguments for the purpose of shewing that they deemed their animal sacrifices, not only of *expiatory*, but of a strictly *vicarious* nature, will, to those who are conversant with the history and writings of the ancients, appear a waste of time. But, as Dr Priestley, in the rage of refutation, has contended even against this position, it may not be useless to cite a few authorities, which may throw additional light, if not upon a fact which is too glaring to receive it, at least upon the pretensions to historical and classical information, of the writer who controverts that fact. What has been already urged in Number V. might perhaps be thought abundant upon this head; but as the testimony of Cæsar respecting the Gauls, in p. 126, is the only one which goes to the precise point of the "substitution of the victim to suffer death in place of the transgressor," it may not be amiss to add the testimonies of Herodotus, (lib. ii. cap. 39) and of Plutarch, (*Isid. et Osir.* p. 363. tom. ii. ed. 1620) respecting the Egyptian practice of imprecating on the head of the victim those evils which the offerers wished to avert from themselves: as also of Servius, (*Æn.* 3, 57) and Suidas, (*in voc.* ϖερίψημα,) ascribing the same sacrificial sentiment; the first to the Massilienses, and the second to the Grecian states. Hesychius, likewise, in substituting for the word ϖερίψημα ("an expiatory, or redeeming sacrifice") the word ἀντίψυχον, (as has been noticed, p. 37) marks, with sufficient clearness, that the expiation was made by offering "life for life." And, not to dwell upon the well known passage in Plautus,[7] (*Epid.* p. 412, ed. 1577) which clearly defines the *expiation* as effected by a *vicarious* suffering; or upon that in Porphyry,[8] (*De Abstin.* lib. iv. p. 396, ed. 1620) in which it is asserted to have been the general tradition, that animal sacrifices were resorted to in such cases as required "life for life," ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς; it may be sufficient to state one authority from Ovid, who, in the sixth book of his *Fasti*, particularly describes the sacrificed animal as a *vicarious* substitute, the several parts of which were given as equivalents, or though not strictly such, yet hoped to be graciously accepted as such, *in place* of the offerer:

---

[6] The above observation may supply an answer to many, who have objected against the alleged existence of a doctrine of vicarious atonement amongst the early Jews the silence of Philo upon that head, even when treating expressly upon the choice of victims for sacrifice.—See particularly *Scripture Account of Sacrifices*, App. p. 17.

> Cor pro corde, precor, pro fibris sumite fibras,
> Hanc animam vobis pro meliore damus.

The observations contained in this Number, joined to those in Numbers V. IX. XXII. and XXIII. when contrasted with the position maintained by Dr Priestley, "that in no nation, ancient or modern, Jew or Heathen, has any idea of a doctrine of atonement, or of any requisite for forgiveness, save repentance and reformation, ever existed,"—may enable the reader to form a just estimate of that writer's competency, and may, perhaps, suggest a useful caution in the admission of his assertions.

No. XXXIV.—Page 14. Col. 2.

ON H. TAYLOR'S OBJECTION OF THE WANT OF A LITERAL CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE MOSAIC SACRIFICE AND THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

H. Taylor goes so far as to use even this argument gravely, (*Ben. Mord.* p. 811—814.)

Indeed, the bold liberties which this writer has been urged to take with the language of Scripture, and the trifling distinctions to which he has been driven for the purpose of divesting the death of Christ of the characters of the sin-offering prescribed by the law, render it desirable that his whole argument upon this particular point should be laid before the reader. When ingenuity, like that of this author, is forced into such straits, the inference is instructive.

"It is true," (he says) "that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews labours to shew a similarity between the Mosaic and the Christian sacrifices; which, no doubt, there was; and, to make out the analogy, uses very hard figures: as when he compares sprinkling the blood of the victim, to the sprinkling our hearts from an evil conscience; and the tabernacle to the body of Christ; and the flesh of Christ to the veil which opened the way into the Sanctum Sanctorum; and calls it a new and a living way; and considers Christ both as the High Priest and Victim. But were the analogy ever so exact, it would not make the expressions literal: and in many particulars there is no manner of likeness between them. For, in the sacrifice of Christ there was no salting with salt, no imposition of hands, no blood sprinkled by the Priest, in which consisted the atonement: for, the atonement was not made by the death of the victim, but by the sprinkling of the blood; since the offender did not offer him to God, nor begged forgiveness of his sins: all which things were customary, and most if not all of them necessary, in a Mosaic expiatory sacrifice of a victim. But this was not the case with Christ. He was crucified and slain, as a common malefactor."

"If it be said, that Christ was the sacrificer, and he offered himself up to God; it should be considered, that the sacrifices of the Mosaic law were offered to gain forgiveness to the person who sacrificed: but this could not be true of Christ, for he had no sin to be forgiven."

"If it be said, that he sacrificed as a *Priest*, to gain forgiveness for others; it should be observed, that, according to the Mosaic law, he was incapable of such an office: for the law requires, that the Priests should be of the tribe of Levi, or the family of Aaron. But he (Christ) 'of whom these things are spoken, pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood,' (Heb. vii. 13, 14.) And, therefore, Saint Paul, who was aware of this objection, when he speaks of Christ as a Priest, tells us, that he was a priest of a superior order to the Aaronical priesthood, 'being a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek,' (ver. 17.) This is a plain concession, that, according to the Mosaic law, Christ was incapable as a priest to offer any sacrifice. But supposing he had been of the tribe of Levi, the case would have been just the same with regard to all mankind, except the Jews: for the Jewish sacrifices did not extend beyond the circumcision. The sacrifice of Christ could not, therefore, be a propitiatory sacrifice, acccording to the Mosaic law; and much less a propitiation for the sins of the whole world."

---

[7] Men' *piaculum* oportet fieri propter stultitiam tuam,
Ut *meum tergum stultitiæ tuæ subdas succedaneum?*

[8] Ὑπο δε τινας καιρους ϖρωτον ιερειον θυσαι μυθευονται ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς αἰτουμένους.

"If it was therefore a literal offering or sacrifice made by Christ as a *Priest*, it was of a higher nature, and of a prior and superior dispensation to the Mosaic, such as was offered in the days of Melchisedek, the priest of the most high God. But we have no reason to think that any offerings before the law were meant to be expiatory, but all of them eucharistical."

Thus, after labouring to prove that Saint Paul was extravagant in his comparison of the Christian and Mosaic sacrifices, and that all his hard figures had not enabled him to make out a resemblance between them; and labouring to prove this by shewing that Christ was neither literally a Mosaic victim nor a Mosaic priest,—(a point which no man was ever mad enough to contend for,)—thus, I say, after all this, our author, in his concluding paragraph, admits the whole nature and force of the Christian sacrifice, and the true distinction which points out the reason why it should not conform in every minute ceremonial with the formalities of the Mosaic; namely, that it was of a higher nature, and of a prior and superior dispensation. For, as to the accompanying observation intended to do away the effect of this admission, namely, that there is no reason to think that any offerings before the law were meant to be expiatory; this is a mere *gratis dictum*, the contradiction of which, it is hoped, is satisfactorily made out in other parts of this work. And thus it appears, upon the whole, that on a single gratuitous assumption the author rests the entire weight of the preceding argument; and on its strength he has presumed to set up his own doctrines in opposition to those of Saint Paul. Whether, then, in the present instance, this author, ingenious and learned as he undoubtedly is, deserves more to be condemned for his trifling as a reasoner, or for his presumption as a critic, it is not an easy matter to decide.

No. XXXV.—Page 15. Col. 1.

ON THE ARGUMENTS BY WHICH IT IS ATTEMPTED TO PROVE THE PASSOVER NOT TO BE A SACRIFICE.

It is a curious fact, that the declaration of Saint Paul (1 Cor. v. 7) that "Christ our passover is *sacrificed* for us," is adduced by Dr Priestley (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 215) as a convincing proof that Christ was not sacrificed at all. It follows, he says, "from the allusion to the paschal lamb," contained in this passage and others of the New Testament, "that the death of Christ is called a sacrifice only by way of figure; because these two (namely, sacrifice, and the paschal lamb) are quite different and inconsistent ideas:" and the argument by which he endeavours to establish this is not less extraordinary than the position itself, as it brings forward an instance in which one of these totally different and inconsistent ideas is expressly called in the Old Testament by the name of the other; the passover being, in the passage which he quotes from Exod. xii. 27, directly termed "the sacrifice of the Lord's passover."—This seems an odd species of logic. Dr Priestley, however, hopes to mend the argument by asserting, that "this is the only place in the Old Testament, in which the paschal lamb is termed a sacrifice;" and that here "it could be so called only in some secondary and partial, and not in the proper and primary sense of the word;" and for these reasons—namely, that "there was no priest employed upon the occasion, no altar made use of, no burning, nor any part offered to the Lord: all which circumstances (he adds) were essential to every proper sacrifice."—Now, in answer to these several assertions, I am obliged to state the direct contradiction of each: for, 1. The passage in Exodus, xii. 27, is not the only one in which the paschal lamb is termed זבח, "a sacrifice;" it being expressly so called in no less than four passages in Deuteronomy, (xvi. 2, 4, 5, 6,) and also in Exodus, xxxiv. 25, and its parallel passage, xxiii. 18.—2. A priest was employed.—3. An altar was made use of.—4. There was a burning, and a part offered to the Lord: the inwards being burnt upon the altar, and the blood poured out at the foot thereof. Dr Priestley adds, for the completion of his proof, that "the paschal lamb is very far from having been ever called a sin-offering, or said to be killed on the account of sin." But neither is the burnt-offering "ever called a sin-offering," nor is the animal slain in any of the various kinds of peace-offering, whether in the votive, the free-will, or the sacrifice of thanksgiving, ever "said to be killed on account of sin." In other words, one species of sacrifice is not the same with, nor to be called by the name of another. I agree with Dr Priestley in this position, and shall not dispute with him any conclusion he may draw from so productive a premiss.

But so evident is it that the passover was truly a sacrifice, that even Sykes himself (whose work on Redemption has been the great armoury whence Dr Priestley and the other combatants of that doctrine have derived their principal weapons of attack) found it impossible to deny the position. He accordingly fully admits the point. (*Essay on Sacrifices*, p. 41.) And, indeed, whoever considers what are the essential characters of a sacrifice, can have little difficulty upon this head, as the passover will be found to possess them all.

1. It was a "Corban," or "offering brought to the tabernacle or temple," as we find it expressly enjoined in Deut. xvi. 2, 5, 6, and exemplified at the solemn passover in the reign of Josiah, 2 Chron. xxxv. 5, 6, 10, 11. That the tabernacle or temple, is intended by the expressions used in the passage of Deuteronomy above referred to, and not Jerusalem at large, is evident from this, that the very same expressions are employed when speaking of all the sacrifices and offerings, in Deut. xii. 5, 6, 11, 14, where it is manifest that the temple, the peculiar habitation of God, is necessarily meant. This still farther appears from 1 Kings, viii. 29, and 2 Chron. vii. 16. Moreover, we find the passover expressly called a Corban, (Numb. ix. 6, 7, 13,) and it is certain that nothing was so called but what was brought and offered up to God at the tabernacle or temple, (see Cudw. *Int. Syst. Discourse*, &c. p. 13.) We may also add, that it is actually specified by Maimonides, as the reason why the Jews of later times cannot kill the paschal lamb, that they have no temple to offer it in,[1] (see Ainsw. on Exod. xii. 8.)—2. The blood of the paschal lamb was poured out, sprinkled, and offered at the altar by the priests, in like manner as the blood of the victims usually slain in sacrifice, as appears from Exod. xxiii. 18, and xxxiv. 25; 2 Chron. xxx. 15, 16, and xxxv. 11. And in this sprinkling of the blood consisted, as we are told by the Jewish doctors, the very essence of a sacrifice, (see Cudw. *ut supra*, p. 10.)—3. The fat and entrails were burnt upon the altar, as may be collected from the accounts given of the ceremony of the passover in the passages already referred to, as also from the declarations of the Jewish doctors, the description of the paschal sacrifice in the Misna of the Talmud, and the testimony of the Karraites, who are known to reject all the Talmudical traditions not founded on Scripture.[2] Thus, then, all the distinguishing characters of a sacrifice,[3] we find to belong to the offering of the paschal lamb. It was brought to the temple as a Corban, or sacred offering to the Lord. It was slain in the courts of the temple, and the blood was received by the priests, and handed to the high priest, who, pouring it forth, and sprinkling it before the altar, offered it together with the fat and entrails, which were burnt upon the altar.

One circumstance, indeed, has been urged, which wears the appearance of an objection, namely, that the paschal lamb was slain not by the priest, but by the person who brought it to the temple. Philo, in his *Life of Moses*, (p. 686,) has stated this, as distinguishing the passover from all other sacrifices, (which, by the way, clearly implies that he considers that to be a sacrifice as well as the rest; and so, indeed, he expressly calls it, Πάνδημος ΘΥΣΙΑ—*De Sept. et Fest.* p. 1190.) In this, however, as in many other particulars of the Jewish rites, Philo is manifestly mistaken, this being by no means peculiar to the passover; for that, in every kind of sacrifice, the individual that offered it might kill the sacrifice, is evident from the instance of the burnt-offering in Levit. i. 4, 5; from that of the peace-offering, iii. 2; and from that of the sin-offering, iv. 24; the proper duty of the priests being only to sprinkle the blood, and to place upon the altar whatever was to be offered.[4] It must certainly be admitted, that the ceremony of laying hands upon the head of the victim, which was usual in other sacrifices, was not adopted in that of the passover. This distinction, however, at the same time that it is noticed by Sykes, (*Essay*, &c. p. 41) is sufficiently accounted for by that writer, inasmuch as "the paschal lamb was the sacrifice of a company, and where a company are concerned, no one can act for the whole, unless there be a proper representative, as the elders of a congregation are for the congregation, or persons deputed are for those who depute them, or governors may be for their people."

---

[1] Bishop Patrick in a note on Exod. xii. 21, makes the following observation:—"Here it may be fit to note, that the lamb being first killed in Egypt, it was killed in every man's house, for they had no altar there, nor any other place where they had liberty to kill it. But after they came to the land of Canaan, it was not lawful to sacrifice it any where, but in the place which God appointed for his worship, Deut. xvi. 2. From which Maimonides concludes, that whatsoever they did with *other sacrifices*, yet *this* could not be offered in the high places, but only at the temple. And it is likely they did so in the wilderness, the tabernacle being newly erected at the keeping of the second passover, Numb. ix. 5."

[2] See Cudw. *Int. Syst. Disc.* &c. pp. 12, 14, 15, 16.—See also Beausobre's *Introd.* pp. 134, 135, ed. 1790; and Sykes's *Essay on Sacrifices*, p. 41.

[3] "*Pascha* nimirum erat *Sacrificium* proprie dictum, Exod. xxiii. 18. xxxiv. 25. Hinc Pascha ϑύεσθαι dicitur, Marc. xiv. 22. Sed præcipuum est, quod sanguis agni a sacerdote spargebatur, 2 Par. xxx. 16. xxxv. 11. in quo radix, seu essentia *sacrificii* est, inquit canon Judæorum notissimus. Adde, quod in Egypto, ubi nullum erat altare ad quod spargeretur sanguis, huic tamen analogum fuit, quod postes illinebant sanguine agni. Deinde Pascha in loco sacro mactari oportuit, Deut. xvi. 5.—Poli Syn. in Exod. xii. 27. In like manner Bishop Patrick expresses himself on the subject of the Passover. "It is" (he observes) "frequently called by the name of a *sacrifice*, Exod. xxiii. 18. xxxiv. 25. Deut. xvi. 4, 5, 6.—And it is called a Corban; which is a name given only to those things which were brought to be offered up to God. See Numb. ix. 13, where as it is called Corban, so the same word is used for bringing it, which is commonly used about other sacrifices. And it farther appears to have been properly a sacrifice, by the rites belonging to it; for the blood of it was sprinkled by the priests, 2 Chron. xxx. 16, xxxv. 11."—Patr. on Exod. xii. 27.

If farther confirmation can be yet wanted to shew that the passover was truly a sacrifice, we are supplied with this by the express testimony of Josephus; who, in the third book of his *Antiquities*, treating of the subject of sacrifices, calls it the *sacrifice* which the Israelites had been ordered to *sacrifice* when leaving the land of Egypt—*τὴν* ΘΥΣΙΑΝ, *ἣν τότε ἐξιόντας* Αἰγύπτοῦ ΘΥΣΑΙ *ϖροεῖπον ἡμᾶς*, ΠΑΣΧΑ *λεγομένην*.[5] The authority of Josephus, himself a priest, and one of the most intelligent of his nation, will hardly be disputed as to what was considered by the Jews to be a *sacrifice* in his day.

Thus, then, upon the whole, it appears that when Saint Paul declares, that "Christ our Passover has been sacrificed for us," there can be no question that he means a true and effective *sacrifice*, and that Christ has been to Christians that species of sacrifice which the *passover* had been to the Jews.

The question now arises, What was the nature of that sacrifice? The name of the institution, and the circumstances of its appointment, fully explain its import: the original word signifying to *pass over*, not merely in the sense of change of place, but in the sense of sparing, passing without injury. Jehovah in his work of destruction having passed over, and left in safety, the houses of the Israelites, on the door-posts of which the blood of the sacrificed lamb was sprinkled, whilst he slew the first-born in all the houses of the Egyptians.

Now, that the blood of the sacrificed lamb had any natural virtue, whereby the family, on whose door-posts it was sprinkled, might be preserved from the plague; or that Jehovah,[6] in passing, needed any such signal to distinguish between the Egyptians and the Israelites, (although the philosophy of Dr Priestley has not scrupled to admit the supposition—see *Th. Rep.* vol. i. p. 215,) it cannot be necessary to controvert. For what purpose, then, can we conceive such a ceremony to have been instituted, but as a sensible token of the fulfilment of the divine promise of protection and deliverance? And are we not, from the language of Scripture, fully authorized to pronounce that it was, through this, intended as a typical sign of protection from the divine justice by the blood of Christ, which, in reference to this, is called in Heb. xii. 24, "the blood of sprinkling?" Indeed, the analogy is so forcible, that Cudworth does not hesitate to pronounce the slaying of the paschal lamb, in its first institution, to be an expiatory sacrifice; the blood of the lamb sprinkled upon the door-posts of the houses, being the appointed means of preservation by Jehovah's passing over. In confirmation also of the typical import of the ceremony, he notices a very extraordinary passage quoted by Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho, from the ancient copies of the Bible, in which Ezra expounds, in a speech made before the celebration of the passover, the mystery of it as clearly relating to Christ, and which Justin concludes, was at a very early day expunged from the Hebrew copies by the Jews, as too manifestly favouring the cause of Christianity. The passage is too remarkable to omit. "This *passover*," saith Ezra to the people, "is our Saviour and refuge;[7] and if you can feel a firm persuasion that we are about to humble and degrade him in this sign, and afterwards should place our sure trust and hope in him, then this place shall never be made desolate, saith the Lord of Hosts: but if you do not believe in him, nor listen to that which he shall announce, ye shall be a derision to all nations." (Cudw. *Int. Syst. Disc.* p. 16.) L'Enfant thinks the words of St Paul, 1 Cor. v. 7, are a direct allusion to the first sentence of the passage here cited—see Doddridge on 1 Cor. v. 7. Allix in his *Judgment of the Jew. Ch.* p. 333, says, that when John the Baptist speaks of "the Lamb, which takes away the sins of the world," the type of the Paschal lamb is alluded to: and that this appears the more clearly from two things taught amongst the Jews: —1. That the Shechinah delivered Israel out of Egypt: 2. That the Shechinah was typified by the Paschal lamb. But, in proof that the Paschal lamb was a type of Christ, it is not necessary to resort to Jewish traditions. Scripture supplies the most decisive testimonies on the point. Saint John, and Saint Paul, both directly assert it, (Joh. xix. 36, 1 Cor. v. 7;) and our Lord himself seems to affirm it in his institution of the Eucharist at the last supper, (Matt. xxvi. 26.) But whoever wishes to see this point fully examined, may consult Wits. *Œcon. Fœd. de Paschate;* or the selection from that work in Jenning's *Jew. Ant.* vol. ii. pp. 201—208; or a yet more brief, and perhaps not less satisfactory review of the subject, in Beausob. & L'Enfant's *Introd.* pp. 133—138.

---

[4] See Levit. i. 4—9; iii. 2—5; iv. 24—26. See also the Jewish doctors as quoted by Cudworth, *Discourse*, &c. pp. 11, 12, and Jenning's *Jew. Antiq.* vol. ii. p. 191.

[5] *Antiq. Jud.* lib. iii. c. x. Josephi *Opera*, p. 93, A.

[6] *Ἔμελλεν οὖν ὁ Θεὸς ϖλανᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῶν θυρῶν ἐγεγόνει; οὐ φημὶ ἐγὼ, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ϖροεκήρυσσε τὴν μέλλουσαν δι᾽ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενήσεσθαι σωτηρίαν τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων.—Just. Mart.* Thirlb. p. 374.

Patrick on Exod. xii. 13, remarks that the blood was "a sign by which the Israelites were assured of safety and deliverance." And, indeed, the words of the original are, "the blood shall be *to you* for a token." Patrick adds from Epiphanius, that there was a memorial of the transaction preserved even among the Egyptians themselves, though ignorant of the original of the rite. For at the Equinox, (which was the time of the passover,) they marked their cattle and their trees, and one another, *ἐκ μίλτεως*, with red ochre, or some such thing, which they fancied would be a preservative to them.—See Patrick as above.

[7] *Καὶ εἶπεν Εσδρας τῷ Λαῷ Τοῦτο τὸ ϖάσχα ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡ καταφυγὴ ἡμῶν. Καὶ ἐὰν διανοηθῆτε, καὶ ἀναβῇ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν, ὅτι μέλλομεν αὐτὸν ταπεινοῦν ἐν σημείῳ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐλπίσωμεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν, οὐ μὴ ἐρημωθῇ ὁ τόπος αὐτὸς εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον, λέγει ὁ Θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων· Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ϖιστεύσητε αὐτῶ, μηδὲ εἰσακούσητε τοῦ κηρύγματος αὐτοῦ, ἔσεσθε ἐπίχαρμα τοῖς ἔθνεσι.*—(Just. Mart. Thirlb. pp. 292, 293.) Justin says that this passage was among the *ἐξηγήσεις ὧν ἐξηγήσατο Εσδρας εἰς τὸν νόμον τὸν ϖερὶ τοῦ ϖάσχα*: and hence Mr Whitaker concludes (*Origin of Arianism*, p. 305) that it originally stood in Ezra, vi. 19—22, and probably between the 20th and 21st verses. It must, however, be confessed, that the reasons assigned by the learned commentator on the passage here quoted by Justin, leave some reason to doubt its having existed in any genuine copy of the Old Testament. Grabe gives it as his opinion, that the sentence which Justin thus testifies to have stood in the ancient copies of Ezra, is rather to be considered as having crept in from a marginal addition by some early Christian, than as having been expunged from the later copies by Jewish fraud. See also Wolf. *Bibl. Hebr.* vol. ii. p. 85.

Dr Priestley's mode of evading the force of the passage in 1 Cor. v. 7, as a proof that the death of Christ was a sacrifice, has been stated in the beginning of this Number. I shall conclude it by noticing a different mode, adopted by a celebrated fellow-labourer of his in the work of refining away the fair and natural meaning of Scripture language, Dr Sykes. In the words "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us," a plain unbiassed understanding would find it difficult not to discover that the *Passover* is affirmed to be a *sacrifice;* and that, in some corresponding sense, Christ is said to be *sacrificed* for us. Dr Priestley, as we have seen, avoids the latter position, by a direct denial of the former. Dr Sykes, on the other hand, admits the former, and yet peremptorily rejects the latter. Now though Dr Priestley's assertion, that the Passover is not here pronounced to be a sacrifice, may appear sufficiently bold; yet the position, that it is called a *sacrifice,* and that Christ is not in the same sentence said to be *sacrificed,* seems a flight of criticism still more worthy of our admiration. On what ground an exposition so extraordinary is founded, it is natural to inquire. Christ, we are told, is called our *Passover,* inasmuch as by his means our sins are *passed over,* just as by means of the Paschal lamb the children of Israel were passed over in Egypt. So far is well. But how is he said to be *sacrificed* for us? —why, by not being sacrificed at all; but, by being compared to the Paschal lamb, which was a sacrifice! Here is true logic, and rational criticism. If the reader should doubt this to be a fair representation of Dr Sykes's argument, I refer him to the learned Doctor himself, *Scripture Doctrine of Redemption,* No. 640, p. 220.

In justification of what has been advanced in the preceding Number (p. 81) on the signification of the word פסח, I subjoin the following observations.

This Hebrew word, which we translate *Passover,* was rendered by almost all the early interpreters, in the sense which the English word implies; namely *passing over.* Josephus, who calls it *πάσχα,* and sometimes *Φάσκα,* expressly affirms, that the Hebrew word signifies *ὑπερϐασία,* or "passing over;" in commemoration of God's having "passed over" (*ὑπερϐὰς*) the Hebrews, when he smote the Egyptians with his plague, (*Antiq.* p. 65.) Philo, in two distinct parts of his works, explains the word by the term *διάϐασις,* which he uses unequivocally in the sense of passing over, *i. e.* from place to place, (*Opera,* pp. 392, 439.) And, again, in p. 686, he employs the term *τὰ διαϐατήρια,* the "passings over," or from place to place. Aquila in his version renders the word by *ὑπέρϐασις,* "a passing over," using nearly the same term with Josephus. And Jerome adopts the word *transitus,* as the just equivalent of the Hebrew.

Thus far there appears a perfect agreement amongst the ancient versions; affording at the same time a full justification of the phrase by which we render the Hebrew term in our common English Bibles. Some commentators, however, and those of no mean note, for example, Vitringa, Lowth, Dathe, and Rosenmüller, have raised doubts as to the propriety of the sense conveyed by the word *passover,* in explication of the original term פסח. The difficulties that weigh with the two latter are, however, of a nature, to which I cannot help thinking these critics have attached an importance beyond what is justly due. That the Arabic language does not ascribe the sense of *transito* to the word, seems by no means a proof that it cannot admit that meaning, as these authors contend, (Dath. and Rosenm. on Exod. xii. 11, and Dathe more fully, in *Glass. Phil. Sacr.* pp. 968, 969.) Objections drawn from the kindred dialects ought to be admitted, only in the case of such words as are in themselves of a doubtful signification, receiving no illustration either from corresponding passages, or from early versions. Very different is the case of the term in question. Not only, as we have seen, do some of the earliest and most competent translators attribute to it the sense already stated, but several passages of Scripture justify that sense by a corresponding use of the verb from which the word is derived. This will appear by considering the several verses of the twelfth chapter of Exodus, in which the institution of the Passover is prescribed, and the reason of its designation by that term expressly assigned.

The communication is first made to Moses by Jehovah.—11. "It is the Lord's Passover, (פסח) 12. For I will pass (ועברתי) through the land of Egypt this night, and will smite all the first born in the land of Egypt. 13. And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where you are: and when I see the blood, I will *pass* over you, (ופסחתי עלכם) and the plague shall not be upon you for destruction, whilst I smite the land of Egypt." Again, in verse 23, this communication of Jehovah is conveyed by Moses to the elders of the people in the following words: "For the Lord will pass (ועבר) through, to smite the Egyptians, and when he seeth the blood, &c. the Lord will *pass* over the door (ופסח יהוה על הפתח) and will not suffer the destruction (or destroying plague) to come into your houses to smite you." And, lastly, in the 27th verse, when Moses instructs them as to the manner in which they are to explain the rite to their descendants, he tells them that they shall say, "It is the sacrifice of the Lord's *passover* (זבח פסח) who *passed* (פסח) over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians and delivered our houses."

Now, it is evident, that if the verb פסח has been rightly interpreted throughout these passages, the noun derived from it has been rightly explained. Let us, then, here consult the versions. The Septuagint, which uses the Hebrew term throughout for the noun, (viz. ϖάσχα—and so through the Pentateuch, but in Chron. φάσεϰ,) employs different words in rendering the verb. In verse 23, it renders by ϖαρελεύσεται, the very same word by which it translates the verb עבר in the same verse. That the LXX, therefore, admitted the word to bear the sense of *transitus*, or *passing over*, there can be no question. They have, it is true, translated the verb by the word σϰεπάζω, in the 13th and 27th verses: but the sense in which they intend that word may well be doubted, when we find it employed by them in 1 Samuel xxiii. 26, to denote the tumultuous and eager haste of David to accomplish his escape. If, however, we suppose it in this place to imply protection or preservation, the LXX have then substituted the effect of the act of *passing over* for the act itself; and felt themselves justified in doing so, as they had, at the same time, secured the word against abuse by giving (as has been mentioned) its literal acceptation. In like manner we find that the other Greek translators, Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, have rendered the participle פסוח by ὑπερϐαίνων (passing over) in Isa. xxxi. 5, where the term is commonly conceived to be used in direct reference to its application here. The LXX there use the term ϖεριποιήσεται, instead of which Ms. Pachom. reads ϖεριϐήσεται, which Bishop Lowth deems the true reading.

There are versions, however, yet to be noted, which assign to the word פסח, as it occurs in Exod. xii., a sense different from that which we have hitherto assigned. In verse 11, the Targum and Persic both render the noun by *pardon*, *sparing mercy*. Sacrificium *propitiationis* (Arab.) Sacrif. pro *misericordiâ* coram Domino (Ch.) And again, verses 13, 23, 27. Syr. Arab. Pers. and Targ. render the verb in the same sense, that of *sparing;* quod *misertus* est. (Ch.) *propitiatus*, (Syr. Arab.) with which, as we have hinted, the σϰέπασε of the LXX possibly concurs. The Complutensian, in deference to the above authorities, has interpreted the verb throughout this entire chapter by the words *misereri*, *parcere;* and many respectable commentators have adopted the same interpretation.

But, how does this connect with the sense of *passing over*, supported by the former versions? Perhaps, a little attention to the radical meaning of the verb פסח may point out that connection. Fagius, *in locum*, says, that the primary signification of the verb פסח is *saltare*, *transilare;* unde et *claudum* Hebræi פסח, appellant, quod cum ingreditur, quasi *saltare* et *subsilire* videtur. Hence, he adds, the name is derived a *saltu* angeli devastatoris: and he adduces the authority of R. D. Kimchi to this head. That of R. Sol. Jarchi, adduced by Dr Geddes, is more precise. "Oblatio ista (agni paschalis) vocatur *Pesach*, propter *saltum*, quo sanctus ille *Benedictus* transibat domos Israelitarum inter domos Egyptiorum, et saliebat de Egyptio in Egyptium: Israelita autem intermedius incolumis relinquebatur." This primary sense, of springing rapidly, or with a bound, is that which is admitted generally by Hebrew scholars, and seems undoubtedly to be the true one. If, then, we consider it in this light, Jehovah, who is represented as carrying with him the destroying plague, in mercy to the Israelite, passes rapidly over his house, and thereby saves it from the destruction which is borne along to the mansion of the Egyptian, on which it is allowed to rest and execute its fatal work. Thus the *passing* of Jehovah *over* (that is, his rapidly passing over) the houses of the Israelites, and the *sparing* or *shewing mercy* to the Israelites, become naturally connected; and, therefore, either might reasonably be used by interpreters, as the signification of the term in this part of Scripture.

From this view of the case it appears, that Dr Geddes, in his translation, and still more in his *Critical Remarks*, was not very far from a just idea of this subject: but, unfortunately for himself, (from a quaintness, a love of singularity, and a total destitution of taste, which always made what was even right, appear wrong in his hands—nullum quod tetigit non deformavit—) he clothed this just idea in a dress so grotesque, that even he himself was afterwards brought to see and admit the ludicrousness of the garb which he had fixed upon this part of Holy Writ. It is curious enough to trace the origin of the ridiculous epithet *skip-offering*, which has been adopted by this translator, in the writings of one of the most elegant and classical of our Hebrew critics, the celebrated Bishop Lowth; who expressly describes "the common notion of God's passing over the houses of the Israelites to be, that seeing the blood, he passed over, or *skipped* those houses," &c.

This last named critic, following the steps of Vitringa, has in a note upon Isaiah xxxi. 5, given an explanation of the term פסח, with which the signification of the English word *Pass-over* is totally at variance. Both he and Vitringa admit the primary sense of the verb to be that of springing forward, or leaping forward, with rapidity, as it has been before explained; and seem to have altogether adopted the exposition of the word which we have quoted from Fagius. But the notion entertained by these distinguished critics, that two agents were concerned in the preservation of the Israelites on the night of the passover, has led them to assign to the word, as applied in Exodus, the signification of covering, *i. e.* "protecting by covering," as Vitringa, or "springing forward to cover and protect," as Lowth. "Here are manifestly," says the Bishop, "two distinct agents, with which the notion of passing over is not consistent; for that supposes but one agent. The two agents are the destroying angel passing through to smite every house; and Jehovah the protector, keeping pace with him; and who, seeing the door of the Israelite marked with the blood, the token prescribed, leaps forward, throws himself with a sudden motion in the way, opposes the destroying angel, and covers and protects that house against the destroying angel, nor suffers him to smite it."

Here is, undoubtedly, an imposing picture of the transaction, presented to the imagination of the reader; but certainly without any foundation, save what exists in the fancy of the writer. An inaccurate translation, indeed, of the 23d verse seems to afford some colour to this view of the transaction; ולא, יתז המשחית לבא אל־בתיכם לנגף being rendered in our common version, "And will not suffer *the destroyer* to come into your houses to smite you." Rosenmüller attributes this wrong translation to the Septuagint.—"LXX verterunt ὁ ὀλοθρεύων, secuti Judæorum opinionem, tribuentium angelo cuidam, fati ministro, fulgura, pestem, et similia hominibus fatalia: quod commentum et multi Christiani interpretes repetierunt. Sed nil tale in textu." *Schol. in Exod.* xii. 23. Rosenmüller is undoubtedly right in asserting, that there is nothing whatever in the text to justify the idea of a second agent. Whoever reads over the entire chapter with any degree of care, will see, that the Jehovah, who prescribes the rite, is himself the agent throughout, without the least intimation of any other being concerned. For, as to the verse above referred to, its true translation, which I have given in a former part of this discussion, removes at once every semblance of support which it could be supposed to afford to the contrary opinion: the word משחית, (the same which is used in the 13th verse as well as in the 23d,) signifying perditio, vastatio, corruptio, exterminatio, (as see Pol. Syn. also Vatabl. on Exod. xii. 13,) and the נגף למשחית of the 13th verse, signifying exactly the same as the משחית לנגף of the 23d, *i. e.* in both places, the *destroying plague*. Besides, it must be remarked, that the expression *suffer* in the 23d verse, which seems to imply a distinct agent who would enter the house of the Israelite if not prevented, has no authority from the original; the strict translation being "he will not *give*," or "*cause*," (לא יתן); the word נתן never being used in the sense of *permitting*, without the ל marking the dative case of that to which the permission was granted: but the word משחית not only wants the sign of the dative here, but has actually that of the accusative (את) in MS. 69. of Kennicott's.

It appears, then, upon the whole, that the fancy of a twofold agent, indulged in by Vitringa, Lowth, and some other commentators, derives no support whatever from the text of Exodus: and, therefore, the objections, which that fancy alone suggested in opposition to the explanation which has been given of the word פסח, fall to the ground; whilst the admissions of those writers, as to the primary acceptation of the word, must be allowed to stand in confirmation of those very conclusions which they were desirous to overturn.

The passage in Isaiah, indeed, which they were engaged in elucidating, in some degree naturally led them to the view of the subject which we have just noticed. The prophet having there described Jehovah as protecting Jerusalem, in like manner as mother birds protect by hovering over their young; and this being impossible to be conveyed by a term which merely implied *passing over*, and which, so far from indicating an overshadowing protection, on the contrary necessarily induced an exposure of the defenceless young, and this only the more sudden the more rapid was the transition; the commentators deemed it indispensable to extend the meaning of the word פסח (here employed) beyond the latter sense, and to give to it such a signification as would admit the former; and perceiving a strong similarity between the application of the term here, and to the deliverance in Egypt, they endeavoured to explain it in such a sense as would embrace both transactions; and were, accordingly, led to that interpretation of the term, which required the twofold agency of which we have spoken. But, why recur upon every occasion to the primary sense of a word? Are there not in every language numerous words, in which the derivative becomes the prevalent and appropriate sense? And, if we suppose the deliverance from Egypt to have been alluded to by the prophet, (which, as well from the general similitude of subject, as particularly from the use of the terms פסח and הציל which are conjointly used in speaking of the passover and its effect in Exod. xii. 27, seems scarcely to admit of doubt,) what could be more fit than to adopt that form of expression, which, from its familiar association with the deliverance from Egyptian bondage, had long been employed to designate that deliverance, without any reference whatever to its primary acceptation? In other words, was it not most natural, that any providential preservation or deliverance of the Jewish people should be called by the word *Pesach*, the term used to denominate that recorded act whereby the first great preservation and deliverance of Israel was effected? Might not, then, the prophet have properly and beautifully employed the word פסח, in the passage referred to, in the sense of God's acting again as a protector and deliverer of his people, in like manner as he had done at the time of the פסח? This gives new beauty to the original passage, and relieves the comparison between its subject and the deliverance in Egypt from all embarrassment; whilst it retains all that attractive imagery, with which the prophet embellishes the original idea. The passage would then stand thus:—

> As the mother-birds hovering over their young;
> So shall Jehovah, God of hosts, protect Jerusalem,
> Protecting and delivering, preserving (as by a second Passover) and rescuing her.

Bishop Stock, in his translation, has much disfigured the beauty of this passage; neither displaying taste in the expression, nor judgment in the criticism:—*Birds* protecting the *winged race*, being neither elegant nor quite intelligible: and *hopping* round and over, which is rather an odd signification of the word פסוח, being a still odder reason for translating the word by *flying* round.

Some have charged the Greeks with corrupting the original word פסח *Pesach*, by writing it ϖάσχα; and have seemed to intimate that the word was so used by them as if it were derived from ϖάσχω *patior*, intimating the *sufferings* of our Lord, of which the slaying of the passover was a type. That such an allusion may have sometimes been made, as might afford some apparent justification to the charge, there seems reason to admit. (See Glass. *Phil. Sacr.* i. 692, also Greg. Naz. *Serm. de Pasch.* and Wolf. *Cur. Phil.* i. 365.) Yet, the fact is, that the פסח of the Hebrew is written פסחא *Pascha* in the Chaldee, from which the ϖάσχα of the Greek has immediately flowed.

On the subject of the word *Passover*, I shall only add the following enumeration of its various applications:—1. It signifies the passing over of Jehovah, who spared the Israelites when he smote the first-born of the Egyptians. 2. It signifies, by a metonymy, the lamb slain in memory of that deliverance. 3. It signifies the feast-day on which the paschal lamb was slain—viz. the 14th of the first month. 4. and lastly, It signifies the entire continuance and the whole employment of the festival, which commenced with the slaying of the lamb, and continued for seven days.

No. XXXVI.—Page 15. Col. 1.

ON THE MEANING OF THE WORD TRANSLATED "ATONEMENT" IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The meaning of the word כפר, the original of the term *atonement* in the Old Testament, has been modelled, like that of other Scripture phrases, so as to fall in with the theories of those, who are more anxious that Scripture should speak their language, than that they should speak the language of Scripture. The common artifice, by which the terms of Revelation have been discharged of all appropriate meaning, has been here employed with considerable effect. By a comparison of the various passages in which the term occurs, its most general signification is first explored; and in this generic sense it is afterwards explained, in all the particular cases of its application. The manner in which Dr Taylor has exercised this strange species of criticism on the word *atonement*, in his *Scripture Doctrine*, has been already noticed, pp. 50, 51. One or two additional remarks will more fully explain the contrivance, by which this writer has been enabled to shape this expression to his purpose.

Having laid it down as a principle, "that those passages in the Levitical law, in which atonement is said to be made for persons by sacrifice, supply not so many different instances of a known sense of the word *atonement*, but are to be considered as exhibiting one single instance of a sense which is doubtful," (*Scripture Doctrine*, ch. iv. § 69,) he pronounces, (ch. v. § 70,) that "the texts which are to be examined, are those, where the word is used extra-levitically, or with no relation to sacrifices; that we may be able to judge what it imports when applied to them." And agreeably to these notions he conducts his inquiry. Now, what is this, but to pronounce first upon the nature of the thing unknown, and then to engage in its investigation? The meaning of the term, in the several instances of its Levitical application, though as yet supposed unknown, is presumed to be the same in all: and this, notwithstanding that these cases of its application must be as different as its objects,—persons, and things; moral and ceremonial disqualifications.

But, not content with thus deciding on the uniformity of an unknown signification, he proceeds to discover the meaning of the term in those passages which relate to sacrifice, by examining it in others in which it has no such relation. The result of this singularly critical examination is, that from thirty-seven texts, which treat of extra-levitical atonements, it may be inferred "that the means of making atonement for sin in different cases are widely different; being sometimes by the sole goodness of God, sometimes by the prayers of good men, sometimes by repentance, sometimes by disciplinary visitation, sometimes by signal acts of justice and virtue: and that any mean, whereby sinners are reformed, and the judgments of God averted, is atoning, or making atonement, for their sins." (Cap. 6, § 112.) What then follows respecting the *Levitical* atonement? Not, that the word, which, when used extra-levitically, is taken in various senses, according to the natural efficacy of the different means employed, is to be applied in its Levitical designation in a sense yet different from these, agreeably to the difference of means introduced by the Levitical institutions: quite the contrary. When specifically restricted to an appropriate purpose, it ceases to have any distinguishing character; and the term, whose signification, when it had no relation to sacrifice, was diversified with the nature of the means and the circumstances of the occasion, is, upon assuming this new relation, pronounced incapable of any new and characteristic meaning. This argument furnishes a striking instance of that species of sophism, which, from a partial, concludes a total agreement. Having discovered, by a review of those passages which treat of extra-levitical atonements, that these and the sacrifices which were offered for sin agreed in their effect; namely, in procuring the pardon of sin, or the removal of those calamities which had been inflicted as the punishment of it; the writer at once pronounces the extra-levitical and the sacrificial atonements to have been of the same nature throughout; without regarding the utter dissimilarity of the means employed, and without considering that the very question as to the nature of the atonement, is a question involving the means through which it was effected.

But, whilst Dr Taylor has thus endeavoured to overturn the generally received notion of atonement, by an examination of such passages as treat of those atonements which were not sacrificial, Dr Priestley professes to have carefully reviewed all those instances of atonement which were sacrificial; and from this review to have deduced the inference, that the sacrificial atonement merely implies, "the making of any thing clean or holy, so as to be fit to be used in the service of God; or, when applied to a person, fit to come into the presence of God: God being considered as, in a peculiar manner, the king and the sovereign of the Israelitish nation, and, as it were, keeping a court amongst them." (*Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 193.) Dr Priestley, by this representation of the matter, endeavours to remove from view whatever might lead the mind to the idea of propitiating the Deity; and, by taking care to place the condition of persons and things on the same ground, he utterly discards the notion of offence and reconciliation. But, in order to effect this, he has been obliged wholly to overlook the force of the original word, which is translated *atonement*, as well as of that which the LXX have used as its equivalent.

The term כפר, in its primary sense, signifies to smear, or cover with pitch, as appears from Gen. vi. 14.: and from this covering with pitch, it has been metaphorically transferred to things of a different nature; insomuch that, in all the thirty-seven instances of extra-levitical atonement adduced by Dr Taylor, he asserts that the word כפר retains something of this original sense (*Script. Doct.* ch. vi. § 115;) and, agreeably to this, he pronounces "atonement for sin to be the covering of sin." This position seems fully confirmed by Nehem. iv. 45, Psal. xxxii. 1, lxxxv. 2, and other passages in Scripture; in which the pardon of sin is expressed by its being covered, and the punishment of it by its not being covered. And Schindler, in his *Lexicon Pentaglotton*, having in like manner fixed the general signification of the word to be *texit, operuit*, modifies this generic signification according to the change of subject, thus:—de facie, seu irâ, *placavit, reconciliavit;* de peccato, *remisit, condonavit, expiavit;* de sordibus, *expurgavit;* de aliis, *abstulit, removit.*

Agreeably to this explanation of the word, in which Hebrew critics almost universally concur, the LXX render it by ἐξιλάσκομαι, to *appease*, or make *propitious*, and the ancient Latin by *exorare*, and sometimes *deprecari:* (see Sabatier's *Vet. Ital.*) the concealing, and removing from view, whatever is offensive and displeasing to a person, being necessary to reconcile him and render him propitious.

And, indeed, in a sense agreeable to this, that of bringing into a state of concord and reconciliation, the word *atonement* itself had been originally used by our old English writers; with whom, according to Junius, Skinner, and Johnson, it was written *at-one-ment*, signifying *to be at one*, or to *come to an agreement:* and in this very sense we find it used by our own translators, in Levit. xvi. 16, 20, where, speaking of the act whereby the High Priest was directed to make atonement for the holy place, they immediately after call it *reconciling* the holy place.

But Dr Priestley has not only neglected the original and strict signification of the term implying sacrificial atonement, and imposed upon it a sense which at best is but secondary and remote; he has also decided on a partial and hasty view of the subject, even as confined to the English translation: for, surely, although it be in every case of atonement evidently implied, that the thing or person atoned for was thereby cleansed, and so rendered fit for the service of God; it must likewise be admitted, that by this they were rendered pleasing to God, having been before in a state impure and unfit for his service, and being now rendered objects of his approbation and acceptance as fit instruments of his worship. The fallacy of Dr Priestley's interpretation consists in this, that he assumes that to be the sole end of the atonement, which, although an undoubted consequence from it, was inseparably connected with, and subservient to, another and more important effect: the atonement indeed purifying, so as to qualify for the service and worship of God; but this purification consisting in the removal of that, which unfitted and disqualified for such sacred purposes; bringing what before was undeserving the divine regard into a state of agreement with the divine purity, and rendering it the object of the divine approbation. To make atonement, then, to God, was to remove what was offensive; and thus, by conciliating the divine favour, to sanctify for the divine service.

This general meaning of the expression, modified by the circumstance of its application, will lead us to its true value and force in each particular instance. Thus, in the atonements at the consecration of the tabernacle, altars, vessels, and priests, the several instruments and persons destined for the offices of worship, being in their natural state unworthy of this sacred use, were thereby purified from all natural pollution, and rendered fit objects of the divine acceptance. The same may be applied to those atonements appointed for restoring persons to the privileges of public worship, who had been disqualified by circumstances of external impurity; such as were occasioned by natural infirmities, diseases, and accidental events. But whilst in these cases, in which moral character could have no concern, the purifying rite of atonement was enjoined, to render both things and persons worthy and approved instruments of the divine worship;. so in those where moral character was concerned, the atonement made by the sacrifice for sin qualified the transgressor for the divine service, by removing what had been offensive from the sight of him "who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity;" the repentance of the offender, aided by the pious observance of the enjoined rite, averting the divine displeasure, and effecting a reconciliation with his offended sovereign: whilst those who were guilty of a presumptuous and deliberate defiance of the divine authority were cut off from all connection with their God, and no atonement whatever allowed for their transgressions. Episcopius seems to state the case satisfactorily—"Sacrificia pro peccato, ea erant quæ offerebantur ad impuritates expiandas, sive eæ essent morales, sive physicæ aut potius ceremoniales. Morales impuritates voco, istas quæ animorum sunt: id est, quæ culpam aliquam ex animæ sive ignorantia, sive errore, sive imbecillitate ortam in se habent: impuritates enim, quæ per superbiam, &c. contrahebantur, sacrificiis expiari non poterant. Physicas sive ceremoniales impuritates voco, fæditates, sive maculas illas corporis, quæ nulla culpa hominis contrahi possunt; quales sunt quæ ex leprosi, mortui contractu," &c.—*Inst. Theol.* lib. III. sect. II. cap. iii. vol. i. p. 71.

This view of the matter seems to give to the whole of the Levitical atonement a consistent and satisfactory meaning. The atonement, in all cases, producing the effect of fitting for the divine service:—this, in such as involved no consideration of moral character, (as in the consecration of inanimate things, or the atonement for persons labouring under corporeal impurities,) could consist only in the removal of the external impurity, for in such cases this impediment alone existed: whilst in those in which moral character was concerned, as in cases of sin, whereby man, having incurred the displeasure of his God, had disqualified himself for the offices of his worship, the unfitness could have been removed only by such means as, at the same time, removed that displeasure, and restored the offender to the divine favour:—or, in other words, the atonement was in such cases an act of propitiation. And to such cases it is, that it may be applied in the strict sense of the word *reconciliation;* so that the doctrine of atonement, so far as relates to sin, is nothing more than the doctrine of reconciliation.

As to the manner in which the sacrifice for sin may be supposed to have operated to the effecting of this reconciliation, this is of no concern to the present inquiry. That a reconciliation was thereby effected, insomuch that the penalty of the transgression was remitted, and the offender restored to the privileges which he had forfeited by his offence, is abundantly manifest. The instances in Scripture, in which the effect of the atonement is expressly described as the removal of the divine displeasure, are too numerous to be recited. Let a few suffice.—In Exod. xxxii. 30, 32, Moses, addressing the Israelites after the great crime which they had committed in worshipping the golden calf, says, "Ye have sinned a great sin;" and "now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin:" and these words he immediately after explains, by his prayer to God, that he might forgive their sin. Again, we find a stop put to an infliction of punishment, by the atonement made by Aaron for the people in the rebellion of Korah. "And Moses said, take a censer; and go quickly unto the congregation, and make an atonement for them; for there is wrath gone out from the Lord; the plague is begun: and Aaron took as Moses commanded him; and made an atonement for the people — and the plague was stayed," Numb. xvi. 46, 47, 48. The atonement made by Phinehas, and the effect of it, are not less remarkable: God says of him, he "hath turned my wrath away from the children of Israel, (while he was zealous for my sake among them,) that I consumed not the children of Israel in my jealousy—he was zealous for his God, and made an atonement for the children of Israel," Numb. xxv. 11, 13.

The instances of atonement here adduced, are not, indeed, of the sacrificial kind; but they equally serve to evince the Scripture sense of the term, in cases of transgression, to be that of reconciling the offended Deity, by averting his displeasure: so that, when the atonement for sin is said to be made by sacrifice, no doubt can remain, that the sacrifice was strictly a sacrifice of propitiation. Agreeably to this conclusion, we find it expressly declared, in the several cases of piacular oblations for transgression of the divine commands, that the sin, for which atonement was made by those oblations, should be forgiven.[1]

Dr Priestley and H. Taylor have of late endeavoured to subvert this notion, by representing sacrifices merely as gifts, and atonement as nothing but a ceremonial purifying and setting apart from common use, for the divine service, without any idea whatever of propitiation: see *Theol. Repos.* vol. i. p. 199—205, and B. Mord. p. 799—805. How far this theory is invalidated by the observations contained in the present Number, it remains for the reader to judge. I shall only add, that Dr Sykes, whose authority both these writers are in general very willing to acknowledge, does not hesitate to pronounce the sacrificial meaning of the word כפרת *atonement*, to contain the notion of propitiation; deriving it, as has been here done, from the original signification of the word כפר, to cover,—that is, "to remove or take away anger or offence, by so covering it that it may not appear," (*Essay on Sacrifices*, pp. 152, 158, 159;) and "to make atonement for sins," he says, "is to do something by the means of which a man obtains pardon of them," (p. 306.)

How strongly the propitiatory import of the sacrificial atonement, contended for in this note, was attributed to it by modern Jews, has been already amply detailed in Number XXXIII. In Dr Laurence's *Sermon on the Metaphorical Character of the Apostolical Style*, (pp. 17, 32,) there are some good observations on the Targum of Jonathan, tending to confirm the position, that the ideas of atonement, and of forgiveness, were held by the Jews in the time of our Saviour, as perfectly equivalent.

No. XXXVII.—Page 15. Col. 1.

ON THE EFFICACY OF THE MOSAIC ATONEMENT AS APPLIED TO CASES OF MORAL TRANSGRESSION.

For the purpose of reducing the sacrificial atonement to the simple notion of external purification, it has been thought necessary to deny the appointment of any expiation for the transgressor of the moral law. It has been argued, that those sins and iniquities, for which it is in several instances expressly said that forgiveness was procured by the atonement, "do not, in the language of the Old Testament, necessarily imply a deviation from moral rectitude, or a transgression of the moral law; but are frequently used, when nothing more can be understood, than a privation of that bodily purity, which the ceremonial law required; as we read of the iniquity of the sanctuary, (Numb. xviii. 1,) and of the iniquity of the holy things, (Exod. xxviii. 38;) and as we find the ashes of the burnt heifer, though applied only for the purification of external uncleanness, expressly called 'the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin,' (Numb. xix. 7;) and, in like manner, the oblation required from him who had recovered from a leprosy, a sin-offering; the unclean person, though free from blame in a moral point of view, yet in the eye of the law being deemed a sinner." These observations, it is but fair to confess, are to be found in the pages of one of the ablest advocates of the doctrine of atonement. It is also urged that the sins for which atonements were appointed, were, at most, but sins of ignorance, to which scarcely any moral character could attach, and which deserved to be ranked in the same class with mere natural or accidental infirmities. This latter point is largely insisted on by writers who oppose the received doctrine of atonement; and it is particularly enforced by a writer in *Theol. Rep.* vol. iii. who signs himself Eusebius, and who professes to enter fully into an examination of the several cases of atonement recorded in the Old Testament.

---

[1] See Levit. iv. 20, 26, 31, 35; v. 10, 13, 16, 18; vi. 7; xix. 22. Numb. xv. 25, 26, 28. Consult also Hallet's *Notes and Discourses*, vol. ii. p. 270—274.

In reply to the first of these arguments, let it be remarked, 1. That the expressions so much relied on, "iniquity of the holy things, iniquity of the sanctuary," mean merely the profanation, or improper use of the holy things, &c.; so that the iniquity here refers to the persons making this improper use of the holy things, not to the things themselves: and thus the entire objection, derived from the use of this expression, falls to the ground. This appears, as well from the force of the term in the original, which is translated, *iniquity;* as from the context of the passages referred to. The Hebrew word עון being derived from עוה, the strict signification of which is, to turn, or to be turned, aside from the proper state or destination, applies with peculiar propriety to the improper, or profane use of the holy things of the sanctuary. And this sense is supported by the passages in which the expression occurs; the Priests "bearing the iniquity of the Sanctuary," (Numb. xviii. 1,) and Aaron "bearing the iniquity of the holy things," (Ex. xxviii. 38,) manifestly relating, and being understood by every commentator to relate, to the care to be taken that no improper use or legal defilement should profane the sacred things; inasmuch as, in such case, it would rest with Aaron, and with the priests, to bear the punishment of, or make atonement for, such profanation. Thus Jarchi on Numb. xviii. 1. "Upon you I will bring the punishment of the strangers, that shall sin concerning the sanctified things that are delivered unto you." Houbigant translates the words in Numb. sustinebit sanctuarii noxas; *i. e.* as he explains it, reus erit delicti in sanctuarium admissi,—and in Exodus, suscipiet maculas donorum.—See also Ainsworth, Patrick, Calmet, Le Clerc, Dathius, and, in short, all the commentators, who concur in this interpretation; and in like manner explain the passage in Exodus: see likewise Levit. xvi. 16—19.

But as the word *iniquity* thus applied to the sacred things, will not prove, that by sin, in the Levitical law, nothing more was intended than external defilement; so neither will, 2. The application of the terms *sin* and *sin-offering* to persons labouring under mere corporeal impurities. Respecting the case of the burnt heifer, in which, though intended solely for the purification of external uncleanness, the ashes are expressly called "the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin," it must be noted, that the argument here is chiefly derived from the words of the translation, without attending sufficiently to the original; the words in the Hebrew signifying literally, "the ashes of the burnt sin-offering."[1] Purification for sin, then, is not the language of the original; and from this, consequently, nothing can be inferred. But, even admitting that the corporeal impurities arising from leprosy, puerpery, contact of the dead, and other such causes, are spoken of as sins committed by the persons labouring under them, in like manner as the direct and voluntary transgressions of the divine commands; admitting that it is pronounced of the former, equally as of the latter, that, in virtue of the atonement, the sin which had been *committed* was *forgiven* them; admitting that the sin-offering, on these occasions, looked solely to the uncleanness, without having any respect to the general sinfulness and unworthiness of the person seeking to be restored to the privileges of the public worship of God; and admitting that, in looking to the particular instance of uncleanness, it could not have been intended (as the later Jews explain it, see p. 72,[2]) through that, to have referred to that original guilt incurring the penalty of death, from which this and the other infirmities of man's nature had taken their rise; or to some specific crime, by which these bodily inflictions had been incurred:[3]—admitting, I say, all these things, (which however it would be extremely difficult to prove,) and, consequently, admitting that the terms, *sin*, and *sin-offering*, as applied to these, could merely signify external uncleanness, and the appointed means of removing it; yet can this furnish no inference whatever affecting those cases, in which the disqualification to be removed by the sin-offering is expressly stated to be, not that of external uncleanness, but resulting from a transgression of the divine commands. This, however it may be called a legal offence, cannot be thereby divested of its intrinsic nature, but must still inevitably remain a moral transgression. And when atonement is said to be made for sins committed against any of the commandments of the Lord, it must surely be a strange species of interpretation that can confound such sins with mere external pollution, and the forgiveness granted to such offences with the mere cleansing from an accidental impurity. It will appear yet more strange, when we come to notice, under the next head, some specific violations of the moral law, for which atonements were appointed.

---

[1] See Ainsworth, Patrick, and Dathe, on Numb. xix. 17. also Richie's *Pecul. Doctr.* vol. i. p. 212.

[2] See also Ainsworth, on Numb. xix. 16; Lev. xii. 7., and xiv. 32. 34. 49.; and Jennings' *Jew. Antiq.* vol. i. p. 322.

[3] See Episcopius, de lepra, *Inst. Theol.* L. III. sect. ii. cap. 3. § 33.—also p. 72 of this volume.

But it is contended, that those transgressions of the divine commands, for which atonements were appointed, were merely sins of ignorance; to which, as the writer in the *Theol. Rep.* pronounces, scarcely any moral character could attach; and which, therefore, might justly be ranked in the same class with the former cases of accidental defilement. As this argument has been a good deal relied on, it becomes necessary to consider, more particularly, the nature of those transgressions for which atonements were appointed, and the force of that expression in the original, which has been usually understood as implying sins of ignorance.

And 1. it must certainly be admitted, that sins of ignorance, in the direct sense of the word, are intended by the expression, since we find it expressly stated in some places that they wist it not; and, again, that the sins were done without their knowledge, and were hidden from them, and had come to their knowledge after they were committed. (Lev. iv. 13, 14. 23. 28; v. 2, 3. 17, 18; Numb. xv. 24.) Yet, even here, the ignorance intended cannot have been of a nature absolute and invincible, but such as the clear promulgation of their law, and their strict obligation to study it day and night, rendered them accountable for, and which was consequently in a certain degree culpable. Thus Houbigant, on Lev. iv. 2. Nos per imprudentiam, ut multi alii per errorem; melius quam Vulgatus, per ignorantiam. Nam leges per Mosen promulgatas, et sæpe iteratas, ignorare Israelitæ non poterant. This is also agreeable to the general language of Scripture; in which, crimes said to be committed by persons, *κατὰ ἄγνοιαν, in ignorance*, are nevertheless represented strictly as crimes, inasmuch as that ignorance might have been removed by a careful and candid search after their duty; and thus, being voluntary, their ignorance itself was criminal. See Acts, iii. 17, where the Jews who crucified Christ are said to have acted *κατὰ ἄγνοιαν*. Saint Paul also ascribes the enormous wickedness of the Heathen world to "the ignorance that was in them," Eph. iv. 18. And their vicious desires, Saint Peter calls, *ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ἐπιθυμίαις*, "lusts in ignorance," 1 Pet. i. 14.[4]

Thus, then, even though the expression in the original were confined to sins of ignorance, yet would it not follow, that it meant such acts as were incapable of all moral character, and might be classed with mere corporeal infirmities, to which the notion of punishment could not possibly attach. But that the expression, besides sins of ignorance, includes likewise all such as were the consequence of human frailty and inconsideration, whether committed knowingly and wilfully, or otherwise, will appear from considering the true force of the original term שגגה, or משגה, which, together with its root שגג, שגה, or שוג, is found, in numerous passages of Scripture, to signify the species of offence here described, in opposition to that which involves a deliberate and presumptuous contempt of God's authority. Cocceius thus explains it — "Si, putantes licitum, fecerint illicitum, ignorantiâ verbi: aut, si præoccupatus egerit, quod novit esse illicitum." The word, he says, as it occurs in Numb. xv. 22. 24 — 28, is directly opposed to ביד רמה, in verse 30, sinning "with a high hand," that is, deliberately and presumptuously. He also explains it, as implying a full and entire engrossment of mind and affection, producing a temporary oblivion of what is right: which is nothing more than the common effect of any passion which has taken strong hold of the mind. For this he instances Isa. xxviii. 7. In like manner Dr Taylor, in his *Concordance*, understands the word — "שגג, to err, to do what is wrong, through ignorance, mistake, bad advice, or persuasion — or through the violence of some strong passion or affection." Dr Richie also, (*Pecul. Doct.* vol. i. pp. 226, 227,) adduces a great number of passages to prove, that the word in question "denotes any sin, which doth not proceed from a deliberate contempt of authority, but from human frailty or infirmity only." See also Hammond, Le Clerc, and Rosenmüller, in Heb. ix. 7. — where they supply numerous instances to prove, that both *ἀγνοεῖν*, and שגה, are used in the sense here given, as extending to all sins that were not of the class of presumptuous, or such as by the law were necessarily to be punished with death. Rosenmüller adds, that for every sin, except those to which death was annexed, atonement was made on the day of expiation. Now it is remarkable, that, for the sins atoned for on that day, the very word which is used by the Apostle in his Epistle to the Hebrews, (ix. 7,) is *ἀγνοήματα*.[5] But, in fact, the

---

[4] See also Acts, xvii. 30; Rom. x. 3; 1 Tim. i. 13. and numerous other passages of the New Testament.

[5] Schleusner in his *Spicileg. Lexic. in Int. Græc. V. T.* p. 3, thus explains the words *ἀγνοέω* and *ἀγνόημα*. "'Ἀγνοέω notat simpliciter pecco, sine adjunctâ notione ignorantiæ. Erravit Bielius, qui *ἀγνοεῖν* tantum ex ignorantia peccare notare dicit. Cf. *Sirac.* v. 18. *ἐν μεγάλῳ καὶ μικρῷ μὴ ἀγνοεῖ, μηδὲ ἕν*: h. e. nullum plane peccatum committe, nec grave nec leve. Hæc notio etiam ex Hebraicis verbis שגג, אשם, et שגה, quibus *ἀγνοεῖν* in verss. Græc. respondet, apparet." — "'*Ἀγνοήματα*, peccata simpliciter. 1 Macc. xiii. 39, ubi cum vocabulo *ἁμαρτήματα* permutatur. (Cf. Levit. xxvi. 39, ubi Hebraicum עון Aqu. *ἄγνοιαν* reddit.) Locum e Philone huc facientum dedit cl. Loesnerus ad Hebr. ix. 7. Sic *ἀγνωμονεῖν* apud Xen. *Hist. Græc.* I. 7. 10, simpliciter inique agere notat; ubi bene præcipit S. R. Morus, verba apud Græcos, vi originis scientiam aut inscientiam exprimentia, ut in omnibus linguis, notare virtutes et vitia, quæ illam scientiam et inscientiam, vel necessario, vel plerumque, sequi soleant."

Loesner also remarks thus on the words, *ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ* ΑΓΝΟΗΜΑΤΩΝ, in Hebr. ix. 7. — "Apud Alexandrinos Interpp. locis pluribus *ἀγνοίας* vel *ἀγνοήματα* de peccatis et delictis quibusvis ad exprimendum Hebraicum חטאה dici, ignotum esse harum literarum amantibus non potest. Adjungamus Philonem lib. de *Plant. Noe.* p. 229, c. scribentem

opposition already alluded to in Numb. xv. 27, 30, seems at once to decide the point. For there we find the sins implied by the word שגגה, directly opposed to sins of presumption; that is, to such as proceeded, not from human frailty, but from a deliberate and audacious defiance of the divine authority; which appears to be the true meaning of presumptuous sins, as may be collected from Numb. xv. 30, 31; Exod. xxi. 14.—and v. 2. compared with xviii. 11; Deut. i. 42, 43; xvii. 12, 13; xviii. 22, and various other passages. See *Pec. Doct.* vol. i. pp. 229, 230, also *Maim. Mor. Nev.* part. 3. cap. 1. And hence it appears, that, so far as the force of the original term is considered, the efficacy of the atonement was extended to all sins which flowed from the infirmities and passions of human nature; and was withheld only from those which sprang from a presumptuous defiance of the Creator.

The word ἀκουσίως, used by the LXX in the translation of the term, though it seems to imply an involuntary act, is yet by no means inconsistent with this exposition. The force of this term, as applied by the LXX, is evidently not incompatible with a perfect consciousness of the crime committed, and is used only in opposition to ἑκουσίως, by which they every where describe such an act as is entirely spontaneous and deliberate, which, in the words of Episcopius, is performed, plenâ voluntate; or, as he again explains it, which is done wilfully, and with a fixed and deliberate purpose of transgressing. (*Inst. Theol.* lib. iii. sect. ii. cap. 3. § 9. 14.) Ἀκουσίως, then, is not to be considered as denoting an act, strictly speaking, involuntary; but as opposed to what was deliberate and wilful: it is, therefore, applied with propriety to all sins of infirmity. The use of the word ἑκουσίως in Heb. x. 26, throws abundant light on the force of this expression. See Ainsworth on Lev. iv. 2. See also the authorities adduced by Elsner, *Observat. Sacr.* vol. i. p. 494.

But, 2dly, the conclusion, which has been here derived from the signification of the original word, is fully confirmed by the cases of atonement referred to in the text; since the offences there described are clearly such as can by no means be brought within the description of sins of ignorance: it being impossible that a man could deny, or keep back, that which was intrusted to him by another; or take from another his property by violence or deceit; or deny upon oath, and withhold from the proper owner, what he had found, without a consciousness of the guilt. Besides, it is to be observed, that, neither in these, nor in the case of the bond-maid, it is said that the sin was committed in ignorance; but, on the contrary, the very expressions used in the original, unequivocally mark a consciousness of crime in the several instances alluded to; as may be seen particularly in Outram *De Sacrif.* lib. i. cap. xiii. § 4, where this point is fully established in opposition to Episcopius. These crimes, indeed, of fraud, perjury, violent injustice, and debauchery, the writer in the *Theol. Rep.* seems disposed to treat as venial offences, being criminal, as he says, "but in a low degree," (vol. iii. p. 412.) But, for the purpose of proving that no atonements were appointed for transgressions of the moral law, it would be necessary to shew that these acts were not in any degree criminal: this, however, he has not attempted; and he is, consequently, in the conclusion, compelled to admit (p. 414.) that the Levitical atonements extended to violations of the moral law. Sykes also, it must be observed, is obliged to confess, that the cases here alluded to are cases of "known and open wickedness," *Script. Doct. of Redemp.* p. 331.) Hallet expressly says, "It is certain, that there were sacrifices under the law appointed to make atonement for moral evil and for moral guilt; particularly for lying, theft, fraud, extortion, perjury, as it is written, Lev. vi. 1, 2, &c."—*Notes and Discourses*, vol. ii. pp. 277, 278.

Now, that these atonements, in cases of moral transgression, involved a real and literal remission of the offence, that is, of the penalty annexed to it, will appear from considering not only the rigorous sanction of the Mosaic law in general, by which he, "who did not

---

θυσίαι ὑπομιμνήσκουσι τὰς ἑκάστων ᾿ΑΓΝΟΙΑΣ τε καὶ διαμαρτίας, victimæ in memoriam revocant singulorum peccata et delicta."

The observations also of Danzius, on the word ἀγνοήματα in the aforementioned passage of Hebr. deserve particularly to be attended to. "Peccata quæ expianda sunt, vocantur hic ἀγνοήματα. Quæ Socinianis haud alia sunt, quam quæ vel ignorantiâ sive oblivione juris alicujus divini, ex vel ignorantiâ facti et circumstantiarum, vel etiam ex humanâ quâdam imbecillitate proficiscuntur. Equidem concedendum omnino est, ἀγνοήματα hinc inde in scriptis sacris ac profanis pro hujus generis extare peccatis. Quod autem et voluntaria ac graviora haud raro denotet, satis superque docent dicta Psalm xxv. 7, ubi פשע (quod quam magnum designet peccatum, mox dicturi sumus) LXX reddiderunt per ἄγνοιαν. Hoseæ, iv. 15, spiritualis Israelitarum scortatio per verbum ἀγνοέω, pro Ebraico זנה positum, exprimitur; quæ sane leve ac ex ignorantiâ commissum peccatum non fuit: prout ex toto hoc capite satis clare apparet. Etiam Jud. v. 19, 20, pro quibusvis delictis idem vocabulum ponitur. Hinc et Syrus interpres pro ἀγνοήμασι Apostoli in loco citato, (viz. Heb. ix. 7,) posuit ܣܟܠܘܬܐ: quâ voce quævis designantur peccata, (vide Matth. xviii. 35,) etiam illud ab Adamo perpetratum, (vid. Rom. v. 16, sqq.) quod certe nec leve fuit, nec ex ignorantiâ commissum. Imo ex collatione loci Lev. xvi. sole lucidius patet, hic sub voce τῶν ἀγνοημάτων omnis generis contineri peccata. Siquidem ibi satis perspicue docetur, omnia peccata, in anniversario isto sacrificio expiari. Et quidem omnia illa, quæ supra vocibus עון, פשע, ac חטאה erant expressa. Atque sub se continent quidquid omnino venit sub peccati nomine." The writer then proceeds, from a strict investigation of the exact sense of these Hebrew words, as well as from a copious enumeration of the opinions of the great Jewish doctors, to confirm his position, that in the word ἀγνοήματα, as used by the apostle, (Heb. ix. 7,) sins of every description are indiscriminately alluded to. See Danz. *Funct. Pontif. Max. in Adyt. Anniv.* in *Meuschen Nov. Test. cx Talm.* p. 1007—1012.

continue in all the words of the law to do them," was pronounced "accursed," (Gal. iii. 10; Deut. xxvii. 26,) and consequently subjected to the severest temporary inflictions; but also the particular cases, in which the piacular sacrifices are directly stated to have procured a release from the temporal punishments specifically annexed to the transgression: as in the cases of fraud, false swearing, &c. which, with the punishments annexed by the law, and the remission procured by the piacular oblation, may be seen enumerated by Grotius (*De Satisfact. Chr.* cap. x.) and still more fully by Richie, (*Pecul. Doct.* vol. i. pp. 232—252.) Houbigant also speaks of it as a matter beyond question, that, in such offences as admitted of expiation under the Mosaic law, a release from the temporal penalty of the transgression, was the necessary result of the atonement. On Levit. v. 4. he describes the effect of the atonement to be, "ut post expiationem religione factam, non sit amplius legum civilium pœnis obnoxius." Hallet says, that the sacrifices "procured for the offender a deliverance from that punishment of moral guilt, which was appointed by the law;" and he instances the case of theft, in which, though the offender was liable to be cut off by the miraculous judgment of God, yet the sacrifice had the virtue of releasing from that immediate death, which the law had denounced against that particular sin.—*Notes and Disc.* pp. 276—278.

That the remission of sins obtained by the Levitical sacrifices was a remission only of temporal punishments, cannot weaken the general argument; as the sanctions of the law, under which the sacrifices were offered, were themselves but temporary. The remission of the penalty due to the transgression was still real and substantial: the punishment was averted from the offender, who conformed to the appointed rite; and the sacrificial atonement was, consequently, in such cases, an act of propitiation. The sacrifices of the law, indeed, considered merely as the performance of a ceremonial duty, could operate only to the reversal of a ceremonial forfeiture, or the remission of a temporal punishment: that is, they could propitiate God only in his temporal relation to his chosen people, as their Sovereign: and for this plain reason, — because the ostensible performance of the rite being but an act of external submission and homage, when not accompanied with an internal submission of mind and a sincere repentance, it could acquit the offender only in reference to that external law, which exacted obedience to God as a civil prince. In such cases, the Jewish sacrifices, merely as legal observances, operated only to the temporal benefits annexed by the Levitical institution to those expressions of allegiance: but, as genuine and sincere acts of worship and penitence, whenever the piety of the offerer rendered them such, they must likewise have operated to procure that spiritual remission and acceptance, which, antecedent to and independent of the Levitical ordinances, they are found in several parts of Scripture to have been effectual to obtain.

The author of the *Scripture Account of Sacrifices*, (p. 168,) thus reasons upon this subject: — "This people (the Jews,) as to their inward state, were doubtless under the same control, both of the law of nature and of the divine Providence, as they were before the law; this having introduced no change in this respect. They were consequently entitled to the pardon of all their sins, of what nature soever, upon the same terms as before." And then he goes on to shew, that, with the sacrifices of the law, they continued to offer such also as had been customary in the Patriarchal times. And, in proof of this, he adduces instances from the law itself, in which such sacrifices are referred to and recognized. They appear manifestly alluded to in the two first chapters of Leviticus, in which the language marks the offering to be of a purely voluntary nature, and merely prescribes the manner in which such an offering was to be made: whereas, when specific legal and moral offences are to be expiated, the law commands the offering, and the specific nature of it. He adduces also the cases of David, and of Eli's house, to shew that Scripture supplies instances of "sacrifices offered out of the occasions prescribed by the law, for averting the divine displeasure upon the occasion of sin."—(P. 173.) What this writer justly remarks concerning sacrifices distinct from those prescribed by the law, I would apply to all; and consider the penitent and devout sentiments of the offerer, as extending the efficacy of the Levitical sacrifice to the full range of those benefits, which, before the Levitical institution, were conferred on similar genuine acts of worship.

Nor let it be objected to this, that the Apostle has pronounced of the Levitical offerings, that they "could not make perfect as pertaining to the conscience," (Heb. ix. 9; x. 1.) The sacred writer here evidently speaks in comparison. He marks the inferiority of the figure to the substance, and the total insufficiency of the type, considered independently of that from which its entire virtue was derived, to obtain a perfect remission. It might, indeed, he argues, by virtue of the positive institution, effect an external and ceremonial purification; but beyond this it could have no power. "The blood of bulls and of goats could not, of itself, take away sins." It could not render the mere Mosaic worshipper "perfect as to conscience." It can have no such operation, but as connected, in the eye of faith, with that more precious bloodshedding, which can "purge the conscience from dead works to serve the living God." It could not, says Peirce, on Heb. ix. 9, "with reference to the conscience, make perfect the worshipper, who only worshipped with meat and drink offerings and washings," &c.—In this view of the subject, the remarks contained in this Number seem no way inconsistent with the language of the apostle.

One observation more, arising from the passage of the apostle here referred to, I would wish to offer.—In pointing out the inferiority of the Mosaic to the Christian institution, we find the writer, in the tenth chapter, not only asserting the inefficacy of the Mosaic sacrifice for the full and perfect remission of sins, but taking considerable pains to prove it. Now from this it seems, that the Jews themselves, so far from confining their legal atonements to the mere effect of ceremonial purification, were too prone to attribute to them the virtue of a perfect remission of all moral guilt. Of this there can be no question as to the later Jews. Maimonides expressly says in his treatise, *De Pœnit.* cap. i. § 2, that "the scape-goat made atonement for all the transgressions of the law, both the lighter and the more heavy transgressions, whether done presumptuously or ignorantly: all are expiated by the scape-goat, if, indeed, the party repent." I would remark here, that though Maimonides evidently stretches the virtue of the atonement beyond the limits of the law (presumptuous sins not admitting of expiation,) yet he seems to have reasoned on a right principle, in attributing to the sincere and pious sentiments of the offerer the power of extending the efficacy of the atonement to those moral offences, which the legal sin-offering, by itself, could never reach.

No. XXXVIII.—Page 15. Col. 2.

ON THE VICARIOUS IMPORT OF THE MOSAIC SACRIFICES.

I have, in the page here referred to, used the expression vicarious *import*, rather than *vicarious*, to avoid furnishing any colour to the idle charge, made against the doctrine of atonement, of supposing a real substitution in the room of the offender, and a literal translation of his guilt and punishment to the immolated victim; a thing utterly incomprehensible, as neither guilt nor punishment can be conceived, but with reference to consciousness, which cannot be transferred. But to be exposed to suffering, in consequence of another's guilt; and thereby, at the same time, to represent to the offender, and to release him from, the punishment due to his transgression, involves no contradiction whatever. In this sense, the suffering of the animal may be conceived a substitute for the punishment of the offender; inasmuch as it is in virtue of that suffering that the sinner is released. If it be asked, what connection can subsist between the death of the animal and the acquittal of the sinner? I answer, without hesitation, I know not. To unfold divine truths by human philosophy, belongs to those who hold opinions widely different from mine on the subject of atonement. To the Christian it should be sufficient, that Scripture has clearly pronounced this connection to subsist. That the death of the animal could possess no such intrinsic virtue is manifest; but that divine appointment could bestow upon it this expiatory power, will not surely be denied: and as to the fact of such appointment, as well as its reference to that great event from which this virtue was derived, the word of Revelation furnishes abundant evidence, as I trust appears from the second of the Discourses contained in this volume.

Now, that the offering of the animal slain in sacrifice may be considered vicarious in the sense here assigned, that is, vicarious in symbol, (or as representing the penal effects of the offerer's demerits, and his release from the deserved punishment in consequence of the death of the victim,)—seems to require little proof, beyond the passages of Scripture referred to in the text. If farther evidence should, however, be required, we shall find it in a more particular examination of that most solemn service of the yearly atonement, described in p. 22 of this volume Meantime, it may be worth while to inquire, how far the arguments urged in opposition to the vicarious nature of the Mosaic sacrifices will operate against this acceptation. And, for this purpose, it will be sufficient to examine the objections, as stated by Sykes, and H. Taylor; inasmuch as the industry of the former, and the subtilty of the latter, have left none of the arguments of Socinus, Crellius, or the other learned antagonists of the doctrine of atonement, unnoticed or unimproved; and the skirmishing writers of the present day have done nothing more than retail, with diminished force, the same objections.

They are all reduced by Sykes and Taylor under the following heads:—1. It is no where said in the Old Testament, that the life of the victim was given as a vicarious substitute for the life of him who offered it. 2. The atonement was not made by the death of the animal, but by the sprinkling of the blood at the altar. 3. No atonement could be made, where life was forfeited. 4. Atonements were made by the sacrifice of animals in some cases where no guilt was involved. And, 5. Atonements were sometimes made without the death of an animal, or any blood-shedding whatever.[1]—This is the sum total of the arguments, collected by the industry of these writers, against the notion of the vicarious nature of sacrifice: and it must be remembered, that Sykes applies these to the idea, that "the taking away the life of the animal was designed to put the offerer in mind of his demerits," no less than to the idea, that "the life of the animal was given in lieu of the life of the sinner;" (pp. 120, 121.) so that they may fairly be replied to, on the principle of atonement here contended for.

---

[1] See Sykes's *Essay on Sacr.* pp. 121—141. *Ben. Mord.* pp. 797—799. and Crell. *contra Grot.* cap. x.

Now, to the first of these objections it may be answered, that it is again and again asserted in the Old Testament, that, in cases where punishment had been incurred, and even where (as we shall see hereafter) life itself was forfeited, the due oblation of an animal in sacrifice was effectual to procure the reversal of the forfeiture, and the pardon of the offender; that is, the death of the animal was so far represented as standing in place of the offender's punishment, and in some cases even of his death, that through it, no matter how operating, the offerer was enabled to escape. This, however, is not deemed sufficient. Some precise and appropriate phrase, unequivocally marking a strict vicarious substitution, is still required. But as a strict vicarious substitution, or literal equivalent, is not contended for, no such notion belonging to the doctrine of atonement, it is not necessary that any such phrase should be produced. The words, כפר, and נשא, in their sacrificial application, sufficiently admit the vicarious import; and the description of the sacrificial ceremony and its consequences, especially in the instance of the scape-goat, positively prove it; and beyond this nothing farther can be required.

But it is curious to remark, that both Sykes and Taylor, in their eagerness to demonstrate that the sacrificial terms conveyed nothing whatever of a vicarious import, have urged an objection which rebounds with decisive force against their own opinion. "The life of the animal," say they, "is never called, in the Old Testament, a ransom; nor is there any such expression as *λύτϱον*, *ἀντίλυτϱον*, *ἀντίψυχον*, equivalent, exchange, substitute," &c. *Essay on Sacr.* p. 134. *B. Mord.* p. 197.—Now, not to speak of their criticisms on the expressions in the original, (particularly on the word כפר,) which merely go to prove that these words do not necessarily convey such ideas, inasmuch as, being of a more extended signification, they are not in all cases applied exactly in this sense—an argument which will easily strip most Hebrew terms of their true and definite meaning, being, as they are denominated by Grotius, (*De Satis. Chr.* cap. viii. § 2, 3,) *ϖολύσημοι*—not to speak, I say, of such criticisms, nor to urge the unfairness of concluding against the meaning of the original, from the language used in the Greek translation; have not these writers, by admitting that the words *λύτϱον*, *ἀντίλυτϱον*, &c. if applied to the Mosaic sacrifices, would have conveyed the idea of vicarious substitution, thereby established the force of these expressions, when applied in the New Testament to the death of Christ, (Matt. xx. 28; Mark, x. 46; 1 Tim. ii. 6,) which, being expressly said to be a sacrifice for the sins of men, and being that true and substantial sacrifice, which those of the law but faintly and imperfectly represented, consequently reflects back upon them its attributes and qualities, though in an inferior degree?

Again, secondly, it is contended, that the atonement was not made by the death of the animal, but by the sprinkling of the blood.—True; and by this very sprinkling of the blood before the altar it was, that, according to the prescribed rites of sacrifice, the life of the animal was offered; as appears from the express letter of the law, which declares "the life to be in the blood," and subjoins, as a consequence from this, that "it is the blood," (the vehicle of life, or, as it is called a few verses after, the life itself,) "that maketh an atonement for the soul," or life, of the offerer. See Ainsworth and Patrick on Levit. xvii. 11; and for the concurrent opinions of all the Jewish doctors on this head, see Outram, *de Sacrif.* lib. i. cap. xxii. § 11.—The rendering of the above verse of Leviticus in the old Italic version is remarkable; "Anima enim omnis carnis sanguis ejus est: et ego dedi eum vobis, exorare pro animabus vestris; sanguis enim ejus pro animâ exorabit." Sabatier. *Vet. Ital.* And even Dr Geddes's translation is decidedly in favour of the sense in which the passage has been applied in this number. "For the life of all flesh being in the blood, it is my will, that by it an atonement shall be made, at the altar, for your lives."

But, thirdly, the sacrifice could not have implied any thing vicarious, as no atonement could be made where life was forfeited.—There is no argument advanced by the opponents of the doctrine of atonement with greater confidence than this, and there is none which abounds with greater fallacies. It is untrue, in point of fact; it is sophistical, in point of reasoning; and it is impertinent, in point of application.

1. It is untrue; for atonements were made in cases where, without atonement, life was forfeited. This appears, at once, from the passage of Leviticus last referred to; which positively asserts the atonement to be made for the life of the offerer: it also appears from the unbending rigour of the law in general, which seems to have denounced death against every violation of it, (see Deut. xxvii. 26; Ezek. xviii. 19—23; Gal. iii. 10; James, ii. 10;) and, in particular, from the specific

cases of perjury, (Levit. vi. 3,) and of profane swearing, (ver. 4,) for which atonements were appointed, notwithstanding the strict sentence of the law was death, (Exod. xx. 7; and Levit. xxiv. 16,)—see on this Grot. *De Satisf.* cap. x. § 3; Hallet's *Notes and Disc.* pp. 275—278; and Richie's *Pecul. Doct.* vol. i. pp. 245—249, 280. This last writer, it is to be observed, though opposing the doctrine of vicarious suffering, and wishing to avail himself of the objection here urged, yet finds himself not at liberty to advance farther than to state that it seldom happened that death was denounced against any offences for which atonement was appointed.

2. It is sophistical; for, from the circumstances of atonement not being appointed in those cases in which death was peremptorily denounced, it is inferred, that no atonement could be made where life was forfeited; whereas the true statement of the proposition evidently is, that life was forfeited where no atonement was permitted to be made. It is true, indeed, that death is not expressly denounced in those cases in which atonements were allowed; but this was because the atonement was permitted to arrest the sentence of the law; as appears particularly from this, that, where the prescribed atonement was not made, the law, no longer suspended in its natural operation, pronounced the sentence of death. The real nature of the case seems to be this: the rigid tendency of the law being to secure obedience, on pain of forfeiture of life, all such offences as were of so aggravated a kind as to preclude forgiveness, were left under the original sentence of the law, whilst such as were attended with circumstances of mitigation were forgiven, on the condition of a public and humble acknowledgment of the offence, by complying with certain prescribed modes of atonement. It should be remembered, also, that the law was not given at different times, so as that its denunciations and atonements should be promulged at different periods; both were announced at the same time, and therefore, in such cases as admitted of pardon, the penalty being superseded by the atonement, the punishment strictly due to the offence is consequently not denounced, and can only be collected now from the general tendency of the law, from some collateral bearings of the Mosaic code, or from the inflictions which actually followed on the neglect of the atonement. The whole strength of the present objection rests, then, upon this:—that we have not both the atonement prescribed, and the punishment denounced; that is, the punishment both remitted and denounced, at the same time.

But I have dwelt too long upon this; especially when, 3*dly*, the whole argument is inapplicable. For even they who hold the doctrine of a vicarious punishment, feel it not necessary to contend that the evil inflicted on the victim should be exactly the same in quality and degree with that denounced against the offender; it depending, they say, upon the will of the legislator, what satisfaction he will accept in place of the punishment of the offender, see Outram *De Sacr.* lib. i. cap. xxi. § 1, 2, 9. But still less will this argument apply, where vicarious punishment is not contended for, but merely an emblematic substitute, the result of institution, and which in no respect involves the notion of an equivalent.

Fourthly, The atonement by animal sacrifice, in cases not involving moral guilt, can only prove, that there were sacrifices which were not vicarious, inasmuch as there were some that were not for sin; but it by no means follows, that where moral guilt was involved, the sacrifice was not vicarious. Now, it is only in this latter case that the notion of a vicarious sacrifice is contended for, or is, indeed, conceivable. And, accordingly, it is only in such cases that we find those ceremonies used, which mark the vicarious import of the sacrifice. The symbolical translation of sins, and the consequent pollution of the victim, are confined to those sacrifices which were offered confessedly in expiation of sins; the most eminent of which were those offered on the day of expiation, and those for the High Priest, and for the entire congregation, (Lev. xvi. 15—28; iv. 3—12, and 13—22,) in all of which, the pollution caused by the symbolical transfer of sins is expressed by the burning of the victim without the camp: see Outr. *De Sacr.* lib. i. cap. xvii. § 1, 2. Thus it appears, that the very mode of sacrifice, as well as the occasion of its being offered, clearly ascertained the case of its vicarious import.

But it deserves to be considered, whether even the cases of the puerpera, the leper, and the Nazarite, on which, as they seem to imply nothing of crime, Sykes and other writers of that class lay so much stress, do not bear such a relation to sin as to justify the oblation of the animal sacrifice in the view here contended for. It deserves to be considered, whether the pains of childbearing, and all diseases of the human body, (of which leprosy in the Eastern countries was deemed the most grievous,) being the signal consequences of that apostacy which had entailed these calamities on the children of Adam, it might not be proper, on occasion of a deliverance from these remarkable effects of sin, that there should be this sensible representation of that death which was the desert of it in general, and an humble acknowledgment of that personal demerit, which had actually exposed the offerer on so many occasions to the severest punishment. That this was the notion entertained by the Jewish doctors, with the additional circumstance of the imputation of actual crime, in these cases of human suffering, has been already shewn, p. 72.—See also Vitringa on Isai. liii. 4. There seems, likewise, good ground to think, that the idea of distempers as penal inflictions for sins, was prevalent in the earliest ages even among the heathen, see Harris's *Comment. on* ch. liii. *of Isaiah*, p. 235, also Martini, as quoted by Rosenm. *Schol. in Jesai.* p. 909. The case of the Nazarite, it must be confessed, seems more difficult to be reconciled to the principle here laid down. And yet, if with Lightfoot (*Hor. Hebr.* in Luc. i. 15,) it be admitted, that "the law of the Nazarites had a reference to Adam, while under the prohibition in his state of innocence," and that it was "designed in commemoration of the state of innocence before the Fall," (an idea for which he finds strong support in the traditions of the Jews,) it may seem not unreasonable to conclude, that the sacrifice offered by the Nazarite polluted by the *dead*, was intended to commemorate that death which was the consequence of Adam's fall from innocence, and which was now become the desert of sinful man. And thus the case of the Nazarite, as well as those of the puerpera and the leper, seems sufficiently reducible to the notion of sacrifice here laid down. But let this be as it may, it is clear, that to prove that a sacrifice may be vicarious, it is not necessary to shew that every sacrifice is so; no more than, for the purpose of proving that there are sacrifices for sins, it is necessary to shew that every sacrifice is of that nature.

We come now to the fifth, and last, objection; in which it is urged, that atonements for sin being made in some cases without any animal sacrifice, but merely by an offering of flour, by piacular sacrifice it could never be intended to imply the vicarious substitution of a life. To this the answer is obvious, that although no vicarious substitution of a life could be conceived, where life was not given at all, yet from this it cannot follow, that, where a life was given, it might not admit a vicarious import. It should be remembered, that the case here alluded to was a case of necessity; and that this offering of flour was accepted, only where the offerer was so poor that he could not by any possibility procure an animal for sacrifice. Can then any thing be inferred from a case, such as this, in which the offerer must have been altogether precluded from engaging in any form of worship, and shut out from all legal communion with his God, or indulged in this inferior sort of offering? Besides, is it not natural to conceive, that this offering of flour being indulged to the poor man, in the place of the animal sacrifice which, had he been able, he was bound to offer, he should consider it but as a substitute for the animal sacrifice, and that, being burnt and destroyed upon the altar, he might naturally conceive of it as a symbol and representation of that destruction due to his own demerits? And to all this it may be added, that this individual might be taught to look to the animal sacrifices, offered for all the sins of all the people on the day of atonement, for the full and complete consummation of those less perfect atonements, which alone he had been able to make.

These constitute the sum total of the arguments, which have been urged against the vicarious nature of the legal piacular atonements. How far they are conclusive against the notion of their vicarious import here contended for, it is not difficult to judge. It deserves to be noted, that, in the examination of these arguments, I have allowed them the full benefit of the advantage which their authors have artfully sought for them; namely, that of appreciating their value as applied to the sacrifices of the law, considered independently of that great sacrifice, which these were but intended to prefigure, and from which alone they derived whatever virtue they possessed. When we come hereafter to consider them as connected with that event in which their true significancy lay, we shall find the observations which have been here made acquiring a tenfold strength.

What the opinions of the Jewish writers are upon the subject of this Number, has been already explained in Number XXXIII. Whoever wishes for a more extensive review of the testimonies which they supply, on the three points,—of the translation of the offerer's sins,—the consequent pollution of the animal,—and the redemption of the sinner by the substitution of the victim,—may consult Outram, *De Sacrif.* lib. i. cap. xxii. § 4—12.

No. XXXIX.—Page 15. Col. 2.

ON THE IMPOSITION OF HANDS UPON THE HEAD OF THE VICTIM.

The ceremony of the imposition of hands upon the head of the victim has been usually considered, in the case of piacular sacrifices, as a symbolical translation of the sins of the offender upon the head of the sacrifice, and as a mode of deprecating the evil due to his transgressions. So we find it represented by Abarbanel, in the *Introduction to his Commentary on Leviticus*, (*De Viel.* p. 301:) and so the ceremony of the scape-goat, in Lev. xvi. 21, seems directly to assert. And it is certain, that the practice of imprecating on the head of the victim the evils which the sacrificer wished to avert from himself, was usual amongst the heathen; as appears, particularly, from Herodotus, (lib. ii. cap. xxxix.) who relates this of the Egyptians, and at the same time asserts that no Egyptian would so much as "taste the head of any animal," but, under the influence of this religious custom, flung it into the river. This interpretation of the ceremony of the imposition of hands, in the Mosaic sacrifice, is, however strongly contested by certain writers, particularly by Sykes, (*Essay on Sacrif.* pp. 25—50.) and the author of the *Scripture Account of Sacrifices,* (Append. p. 10.) who contend that this ceremony was not confined to piacular sacrifices, but was also used in those which were eucharistical, "in which commemoration was made, not of sins, but of mercies:" it was not, therefore, say they, always accompanied with confession of sins, but with praise, or thanksgiving, or, in short, such concomitant as suited the nature and intention of the particular sacrifice. But, in order to prove that it was not attended with acknowledgment of sin, in sacrifices not piacular, it is necessary to shew that in none but piacular was there any reference whatever to sin. In these, indeed, the pardon of sin is the appropriate object; but that in our expressions of praise and thanksgiving, acknowledgment should be made of our own unworthiness, and of the general desert of sin, seems not unreasonable. That even the eucharistic sacrifices, then, might bear some relation to sin, especially if animal sacrifice in its first institution was designed to represent that death which had been introduced by sin, will perhaps not be deemed improbable. And in confirmation of this, it is certain, that the Jewish doctors combine, in all cases, confession of sins, with imposition of hands. "Where there is no confession of sins," say they, "there is no imposition of hands."—See Outram, *De Sacr.* lib. i. cap. xv. § 8.

But, be this as it may, it is at all events clear, that if the ceremony be admitted to have had, in each kind of sacrifice, the signification suited to its peculiar nature and intention, it necessarily follows, that, when used in piacular sacrifices, it implied a reference to, and acknowledgment of, sin: confession of sins being always undoubtedly connected with piacular sacrifices; as appears from Levit. v. 5. xvi. 21. and Numb. v. 7. The particular forms of confession, used in the different kinds of piacular sacrifice, are also handed down to us by the Jewish writers; and are given by Outram, (*De Sacr.* lib. i. cap. xv. § 10, 11.) The form prescribed for the individual, presenting his own sacrifice, seems particularly significant: "O God, I have sinned, I have done perversely, I have trespassed before thee, and have done so and so. Lo! now I repent, and am truly sorry for my misdeeds. Let then this victim be my expiation." Which last words were accompanied by the action of laying hands on the head of the victim, and were considered by the Jews, as we have seen from several authorities, in p. 70, to be equivalent to this: "Let the evils, which in justice should have fallen upon my head, light upon the head of the victim." See Outram, *De Sacr.* lib. i. cap. xxii. § 5, 6. 9.

Now, that this imposition of hands, joined to the confession of sins, was intended symbolically to transfer the sins of the offerer on the head of the victim, and consequently to point it out as the substitute for the offender, and as the accepted medium of expiation, will appear from the bare recital of the ceremony, as prescribed on the day of expiation. "Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat—and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities," &c. (Lev. xvi. 21, 22.) The sins of the people being thus transferred to the animal, it is afterwards represented to to be so polluted, as to pollute the person that carried it away, (Lev. xvi. 26;) and, by the entire ceremony, expiation is made for the sins of the people. Now it is to be remarked, that this is the only passage in the entire Scripture, in which the meaning of the ceremony of laying hands on the head of the victim is directly explained: and from this, one would naturally think, there could be no difficulty in understanding its true import in all other cases of piacular sacrifice.

But the ingenuity of the writers above mentioned is not to be silenced so easily. The goat, says Dr Sykes, (*Essay,* p. 37,) was so polluted, that it was not sacrificed, but sent away: "it was not, then, to transfer sins upon the sacrifice, that hands were laid upon the head of the victim: as men would not offer unto God, what they knew to be polluted." In this notion, of the pollution of the scape-goat rendering it unfit to be offered in sacrifice, H. Taylor concurs with Sykes, (*Ben. Mord.* pp. 827, 828.)

Now, to the objection here urged it may be answered, 1. That the scape-goat was actually a "part of the sin-offering" for the people, as is shewn more particularly in page 22, and Number LXXI; and as is confessed by the author of the *Scripture Account of Sacrifices,* (Append. p. 12,) who agrees with Sykes in the main part of his objection; and as may be directly collected from Levit. xvi. 5, 10, in which the two goats are called a "sin-offering," and the scape-goat described as "presented before the Lord, to make an atonement with him." See Patrick on these verses.

Secondly, Even admitting the scape-goat to have been entirely distinct from the sin-offering; since the same ceremony, which is allowed by Sykes and H. Taylor to be a proof that the scape-goat was polluted by the translation of the people's sins ; namely, the person who carried it away being obliged to wash, before he was again admitted into the camp ; since, I say, this same ceremony was prescribed with respect to the bullock and the goat which had been sacrificed as sin-offerings, it follows, that they likewise were polluted ; and that, therefore, there was a translation of sins to the animals, that were actually sacrificed in expiation of those sins. Now this translation being accompanied with, is also to be considered as expressed by, the imposition of hands ; a ceremony which it was the less necessary specially to prescribe here, as this was already enjoined for all cases of piacular sacrifice, in Levit. ch. iv.—and that this ceremony did take place we can have no doubt, not only from this general direction in the 4th chapter, but also from the express testimonies of the Jewish writers on this head, (Ainsw. on *Levit.* xvi. 6. 11,) and from the description in 2 Chron. xxix. 23, of the sacrifice offered by Hezekiah, " to make an atonement for all Israel.—They brought forth the he-goats for the sin-offering, before the king and the congregation, and they *laid their hands upon them* —and the priests killed them," &c.

Thirdly, The entire of the notion, that what was polluted (as it is symbolically called) by sin, could not be offered to God, is founded in a mistake, arising from the not distinguishing between the natural[1] impurities and blemishes of the animal (which with good reason unfitted it for a sincere and respectful expression of devotion,) and that emblematical defilement, which arose out of the very act of worship, and existed but in the imagination of the worshipper. It should be remarked, also, that this notion of the defilement of the victim by the transfer of the offerer's sins, so far from being inconsistent with the Mosaic precepts, concerning the pure and unblemished state of the animal chosen for sacrifice, (Exod. xii. 5 ; Lev. xxii. 21 ; Numb. xix. 2. Mal. i. 14, &c.) as is urged by Sykes and H. Taylor, and by Dr Priestley, (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 213,) seems absolutely to require and presuppose this purity, the more clearly to convey the idea that the pollution was the sole result of the translated defilement of the sinner. In like manner we are told in the New Testament, that Christ " was made a curse," and also " sin (or a sin-offering) for us ;" whilst, to make it more clear that all this was the effect of our sin, it is added that he " knew no sin" himself. And, indeed, they who consider the pollution of the victim as naturally irreconcileable with the notion of a sacrifice, as Dr Priestley evidently does, would do well to attend to the *καθάρματα* of the ancients, who, whilst they required for their gods the *τελεία θυσία* the most perfect animals for sacrifice, (see Potter on the *Religion of Greece,* ch. iv. and Outr. *De Sacr.* lib. i. cap. ix. § 3,) at the same time sought to appease them by offering up human victims, whom they had first loaded with imprecations, and whom they in consequence deemed so polluted with the sins of those for whom they were to be offered, that the word *κάθαρμα* became synonymous to what was most execrable and impure, and with the Latins was rendered by the word *scelus*, as if to mark the very extreme and essence of what was sinful. See Stephanus on *κάθαρμα* and Suidas on the words *κάθαρμα* and *περίψημα.*

It must be confessed, indeed, that the author of the *Scrip. Account of Sacr.* has gone upon grounds entirely different from the above named authors. He positively denies, that either the scape-goat, or the bullock, incurred any pollution whatever ; and maintains, that the washing of the persons who carried them away indicated no pollution of the victims, inasmuch as the same washing was prescribed in cases of holiness, not of pollution. (App. p. 11.) But, besides that this author is singular in his notion that the scape-goat was not polluted, he proceeds altogether upon a wrong acceptation of those passages, which relate to persons and things that came into contact with the sin-offering ; it being commonly translated, in Levit. vi. 18, and elsewhere, " he that toucheth them (the sin-offerings) shall be *holy,*" whereas it should be rendered, as Wall properly observes, in quite a different sense, " shall be *sanctified,*" or *cleansed*, shall be under an obligation, or necessity, of cleansing himself, as the LXX understand it, *ἁγιασθήσεται.* See Wall's *Critical Notes*, Levit. vi. 18, where this point is most satisfactorily treated.

Upon the whole, then, there appears no reasonable objection against the idea, that the imposition of hands, in piacular sacrifices, denoted an emblematical transfer of guilt ;[2]

---

[1] The word in the original used to denote the perfect state of the animals to be offered in sacrifice is תמים, which Rosenm. explains by " perfectum, i. e. sine vitio et defectu corporis, sine ægritudine et membrorum debilitate ; id quod Græc. *ἄμωμον*, quod Alexandrini hic habent." Josephus (*Antiq.* lib. iii. cap. x.) calls these animals *ὁλόκληρα καὶ κατὰ μηδὲν λελωβημένα*, " entire and without blemish." Herodotus also (lib. ii. cap. xl.) testifies, that the animals offered by the Egyptians were of the like description : *τοὺς καθαροὺς ἔρσενας τῶν βοῶν καὶ τοὺς μόσχους οἱ πάντες Αἰγύπτιοι θύουσι.*

[2] Dr Geddes's authority, when it happens to be on the side of orthodoxy, is not without its weight ; because, having no very strong bias in that direction, there remains only the *vis veri* to account for his having taken it. I therefore willingly accept his assistance on this subject of the imposition of hands upon the head of the victim. He renders Levit. i. 4, " And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the victim, that it may be an acceptable atonement for him." And on the words, " lay his hand," &c. he subjoins this remark : — " Thereby devoting it to God ; and transferring, as it were, his own guilt upon the victim." A mere typical rite, he adds, derived, probably, from the legal custom of the accusing witness laying his hand upon the head of the criminal. As to Dr Geddes's mode of explaining the matter I am indifferent. *Valeat quantum.*

and that the ceremony consequently implied the desire, that the evil due to the sinner might be averted, by what was to fall on the head of the victim. This receives farther confirmation from the consideration of other parts of Scripture, in which this ceremony of imposition of hands was used without any reference to sacrifice. In Levit. xxiv. 14, 15, we find this action prescribed in the case of the blasphemer, before he was put to death; it being at the same time added, that "whosoever curseth his God shall bear his sin;" thus, as it were, expressing, by this significant action, that the evil consequences of his sin should "fall upon his head:" and in these words, Maimonides expressly says, the blasphemer was marked out for punishment by those who laid their hands upon his head, "thy blood be upon thine own head," (see Outram, *De Sacr.* lib. i. cap. xv. § 8,) "as if to say, the punishment of this sin fall upon thyself, and not on us and the rest of the people." The expressions also in Josh. ii. 19; 2 Sam. i. 16; Esth. ix. 25; Psalm vii. 16, and several other passages of the Old Testament, respecting evils "falling upon the head" of the person to suffer, may give still farther strength to these observations.

It deserves to be remarked, that the sacrifice referred to in the passage cited in the text was that of a burnt-offering, or holocaust; and as the language in which it is spoken of, as being accepted for the offerer, "to make atonement for him," obviously falls in with the interpretation here given of the ceremony of laying hands on the head of the victim, it appears that it was not only in the case of the sin-offering enjoined by the law, that this action was connected with an acknowledgment of sin, but with respect also to that kind of sacrifice which existed before the law; and which, as not arising out of the law, is accordingly not now prescribed; but is spoken of in the very opening of the sacrificial code, as already in familiar use, and offered at the will of the individual: "If any man bring an offering—a burnt-sacrifice," &c.—That the burnt-sacrifice was offered in expiation of sins, has, indeed, been doubted; but so strongly is the reference to sin marked in the description of this sacrifice, that Dr Priestley, on the supposition of its being a voluntary offering, feels himself compelled even to admit it as a consequence, "that in every sacrifice the offerer was considered as a sinner, and that the sacrifice had respect to him in that character," (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. pp. 204, 205,)—a conclusion, so directly subversive of his notion of sacrifices as mere gifts, that, in order to escape from it, he is obliged to deny, in opposition to every commentator, that the burnt-sacrifice here spoken of was a voluntary offering. Now, that the word, לרצנו, should not be translated, as it is in our common version, "of his own voluntary will," I admit with Dr Priestley: it should be rendered, as appears from the use of the word immediately after, and in other parts of Scripture, as well as from the Greek, the Chaldee, the Syriac, and the Arabic versions, "for his acceptance."[3] See Houbig. Ainsw. and Purver. But the present version of this word is far from being the strength of the cause. The manner in which the subject is introduced, and the entire of the context, place it beyond doubt, that the sacrifice spoken of was the voluntary burnt-offering of an individual. And thus Dr Priestley's argument holds good against himself, and he admits that in every sacrifice there was a reference to sin. On the *expiatory* nature of the burnt-offering we shall see more hereafter, in Number LXVII.

No XL.—Page 15. Col. 2.

ON THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE PROOF OF THE PROPITIATORY NATURE OF THE MOSAIC SACRIFICES, INDEPENDENT OF THE ARGUMENT WHICH ESTABLISHES THEIR VICARIOUS IMPORT.

That the Jewish sacrifices were *propitiatory*, or, in other words, that in consequence of the sacrifice of the animal, and in virtue of it either immediately or remotely, the pardon of the offender was procured, is all that my argument requires, in the place referred to by the present Number. The *vicarious* import of the sacrifice seems indeed sufficiently established by shewing, as has been done, that the sins of the offender were transferred in symbol to the victim, and immediately after expiated by the death of the animal, to which they had been so transferred. But this has been an argument *ex abundanti;* and has been introduced, rather for the purpose of evincing the futility of the objections so confidently relied on, than as essential to the present inquiry. The effect of propitiation is all that the argument absolutely demands. For farther discussion of this important subject, I refer the reader to Number XLII.

No. XLI.—Page 15. Col. 2.

ON THE DIVINE INSTITUTION OF SACRIFICE: AND THE TRACES THEREOF DISCOVERABLE IN THE HEATHEN CORRUPTIONS OF THE RITE.

That the rite of sacrifice was not an invention of man, but an ordinance of God; that, however, in passing among the nations of the

---

His admission of the "emblematical transfer of guilt upon the victim" I am perfectly contented with: and, indeed, his illustration, by the witness pointing out the object with whom the guilt lay, does not tend much to weaken the significancy of the action.

[3] The words, לרצנו לפני יהוה, Rosenm. renders, "Ut acceptus sit Deo, Dei favorem sibi conciliet." Levit. i. 3.

earth, it might have become deformed by idolatrous practices, it yet had not sprung from an idolatrous source, — it is the principal object of the second of the Discourses prefixed to this volume, and of many of the Dissertations which are to follow, to establish.[1] I shall not, therefore, here enter upon a discussion of this question, but confine myself merely to a few extracts from Eusebius, with some accompanying observations, upon this subject.

That learned writer, having deduced from the Scripture account of the sacrifices of Abel, Noah, and Abraham, and from the sacrificial institutions by Moses, the fact of a divine appointment, proceeds to explain the nature and true intent of the rite in the following manner: — "Whilst men had no victim that was more excellent, more precious, and more worthy of God, animals were made the price and ransom[2] of their souls. And their substituting these animals in their own room bore, indeed, some affinity to their suffering themselves; in which sense all the ancient worshippers and friends of God made use of them. The Holy Spirit had taught them, that there should one day come a *victim*, more venerable, more holy, and more worthy of God. He had likewise instructed them how to point him out to the world by types and shadows. And thus they became prophets, and were not ignorant of their having been chosen out to represent to mankind the things which God resolved to accomplish." [3] — In other words, he pronounces, that the ancient sacrifices, those prescribed to the patriarchs, and those enjoined by the law, were types and figures, and known to be such, of that one great sacrifice, which was, at a future day, to be offered upon the cross for the sins of the whole human race.

Of the practices which grew out of this original institution, and of the abuses to which it led amongst the heathen world, perhaps the most remarkable may be discovered in the *mystical* offering of the Phenicians recorded by the same writer from Sanchoniatho; which, as well from the extraordinary circumstances of the transaction itself, as from the interesting and important bearing given to it by a late ingenious writer, I here submit to the reader in the words of the historian.

[4] "It was an established custom amongst the ancients" (speaking of the Phenicians,) "on any calamitous or dangerous emergency, for the ruler of the state to offer up, in prevention of the general ruin, the most dearly beloved of his children, as a ransom to avert the divine vengeance. And they who were devoted for this purpose were offered *mystically*. For Kronus, truly, whom the Phenicians call *Il*, and who after his death was translated with divine honours to the star which bears his name, having, whilst he ruled over that

---

[1] Dr Randolph, in his interesting and valuable volume of *Advent Sermons*, has expressed himself with felicity upon this subject. "From those who presumptuously deride the doctrine of Atonement, we would ask some reasonable solution of the origin of sacrifice. Will they make it consistent with any natural idea, will they discover in the blood of an innocent victim, any thing recommendatory in itself of the offerer's suit and devotions? Though they should clear away, what they term, a load of superstition from the Christian worship, they will find it encumbering every altar of their favourite natural religion; they will find these absurdities forming the significant and generally indispensable part of all religious ceremonies: and however disgraced, as we are ready to allow, with every abominable pollution, though retaining nothing to perfect the service, or to purify the offering, still in its expiatory form, in its propitiatory hopes, the sacrifice of heathen nations preserves the features of that sacred and solemn office, which was ordained to keep up the remembrance of guilt, till the full and perfect sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction was made by an eternal Mediator, for the sins of the whole world." *Sermons during Advent*, pp. 46, 47.

[2] Λύτρα τῆς ἑαυτῶν ζωῆς, καὶ ἀντίψυχα.

[3] Euseb. *Demonst. Evang.* lib. i. cap. x. p. 36. The whole of the tenth chapter is well worth attention.

[4] Ἔθος ἦν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις συμφοραῖς τῶν κινδύνων, ἀντὶ τῆς πάντων φθορᾶς, τὸ ἠγαπημένον τῶν τέκνων τοὺς κρατοῦντας ἢ πόλεως, ἢ ἔθνους, εἰς σφαγὴν ἐπιδιδόναι λύτρον τοῖς τιμωροῖς δαίμοσι. Κατεσφάττοντο δὲ οἱ διδόμενοι ΜΥΣΤΙΚΩΣ. — Κρόνος τοίνυν, ὃν οἱ Φοίνικες Ισραὴλ προσαγορεύουσι, βασιλεύων τῆς χώρας, καὶ ὕστερον μετὰ τὴν τοῦ βίου τελευτὴν εἰς τὸν τοῦ Κρόνου ἀστέρα καθιερωθεὶς, ἐξ ἐπιχωρίας Νύμφης, Ἀνωβρὲτ λεγομένης, υἱὸν ἔχων μονογενῆ, ὃν διὰ τοῦτο Ιεοὺδ ἐκάλουν (τοῦ μονογενοῦς οὕτως ἔτι καὶ νῦν καλουμένου παρὰ τοῖς Φοίνιξι,) κινδύνων ἐκ πολέμου μεγίστων κατειληφότων τὴν χώραν, βασιλικῷ κοσμήσας σχήματι τὸν υἱὸν, βωμόν τε κατασκευασάμενος κατέθυσε. Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* lib. i. cap. x. p. 40, and lib. iv. cap. xvi. pp. 156, 157.

It will be remarked here, that the word Ἰσραὴλ, in this extract of Eusebius, I have written *Il* in the translation. This I have done upon the authority of the ablest critics. Grotius, Vossius, and others, are of opinion, that the transcriber of Eusebius meeting with Ἶλ (*Il*) supposed it to be a contraction of the word Ἰσραὴλ (*Israel*) often abridged thus in the MSS. of the Greek Christian writers, and wrote it at full length as we now find it. This is confirmed by the circumstance of Kronus being elsewhere called *Il*, as we learn from Eusebius himself (pp. 36, 37.) On this see Grotius in Deut. xviii. 10. Vossius *De Idol.* lib. i. cap. xviii. p. 143. Marsham. *Can. Chron.* p. 79; and Bryant's *Observat. on Hist.* p. 288. The last named writer says, "Kronus, originally esteemed the supreme deity, as is manifest from his being called *Il* and *Ilus*. It was the same name as the *El* of the Hebrews; and, according to St Jerome, was one of the ten names of God. 'Phœnicibus *Il*, qui Hebræis *El*, quod est unum de decem nominibus Dei.' Damascius, in the life of Isidorus, as it occurs in Photius, mentions that Kronus was worshipped by the people of those parts, under the name of El. Φοίνικες καὶ Σύροι τὸν Κρόνον Ἠλ, καὶ Βῆλ, καὶ Βολάθην ἐπονομάζουσι." *Observations*, &c. p. 289. It should be observed that the אל (*El*) of the Hebrews is written איל (*Il*) in Syriac; and consequently is the *Il* of the Phenicians: so that *Il* and *El* are, without doubt, the same name.

It should not, however, be dissembled, that Stillingfleet (after Scaliger and others) is of opinion, that the word might have been written *Israel* by Eusebius, as we now find it, and that by that Abraham might have been intended. (*Orig. Sacr.* p. 371.) He has not, however, advanced any thing to place this matter beyond doubt. And the authority of Eusebius himself, as already given, with the other references that have been noticed, renders it highly probable that *Il* was the word as originally written. Vossius also (p. 143) remarks, "Parum credibile est, Phœnices pro Deo summo, hoc est Molocho, sive Saturno, habituros *Israelem*, parentem gentis vicinæ, maximeque exosæ; quod satis sacra testatur historia."

people, begotten by a nymph of the country, named Anobret, an only son, thence entitled *Jeud* (it being to this day usual with the Phenicians so to denominate an only son,) had, when the nation was endangered from a most perilous war, after dressing up his son in the emblems of royalty, offered him as a sacrifice on an altar specially prepared for the purpose."

On the Phenician rites, and particularly upon their *mystical* offering here described, the late very learned Mr Bryant has offered some curious and striking observations, from which I have made the following selection, which, I trust, will not be unacceptable to the reader.

After speaking of the sacrifices customary with various nations, especially their human sacrifices, he goes on to say, — "These nations had certainly a notion of a *federal* and an *expiatory* sacrifice. It was derived to them by tradition; and though originally founded in truth, yet, being by degrees darkened and misapplied, it gave rise to the worst of profanations, and was the source of the basest and most unnatural cruelty. I have shewn at large that human victims were very common among the Phenicians: and Philo Byblius tells us from Sanchoniatho, that in some of their sacrifices there was a particular mystery: 'they who were devoted for this purpose, were offered *mystically*,' that is, under a mystical representation; and he proceeds to inform us, that 'it was in consequence of an example which had been set this people by the God Kronus, who in a time of distress offered up his only son to his father Ouranus.'"[5] — He observes, that there is something in the account so very extraordinary as to deserve most particular attention; and, after quoting the passage from Eusebius, which I have given at full length in page 100, he remarks, that "if nothing more be meant by it, than that a king of the country sacrificed his son, and that the people afterwards copied his example, it supplies a cruel precedent too blindly followed, but contains nothing in it of a *mystery*." —"When a fact" (he adds) "is supposed to have a *mystical* reference, there should be something more than a bare imitation. Whatever may have been alluded to under this typical representation, it was, I believe, but imperfectly understood by the Phenicians; and is derived to us still more obscurely, by being transmitted through a secondary channel."[6]

Our author, having cleared the history from some obscurities and apparent contradictions, proceeds to his final result: — "This is the only instance of any sacrifice in the Gentile world, which is said to be *mystical*; and it was attended with circumstances which are very extraordinary. *Kronus*, we find, was the same with *El*, and *Elioun*: and he is termed Ὕψιστος and Ὑψουράνιος. He is, moreover, said to have the Elohim for his coadjutors: Σύμμαχοι Ἴλου, τοῦ Κρόνου, Ἐλωεὶμ ἐπεκλήθησαν. (*Præp. Evang*. p. 37.) He had no father[7] to make any offering to; for he was the father of all, and termed Κύριος Οὐρανοῦ, with the confession of the author by whom the account is given. These sacrifices, therefore, had no reference to any thing past, but alluded to a great event to be accomplished afterwards. They were instituted, probably, in consequence of a prophetic tradition, which I imagine had been preserved in the family of Esau, and transmitted through his posterity to the people of Canaan. The account is mixed with much extraneous matter, but, divesting it of fable, we may arrive at the truth which is concealed beneath. The mystical sacrifice of the Phenicians had these requisites; that *a prince was to offer it*; and *his only son was to be the victim*: and as I have shewn that this could not relate to any thing prior, let us consider what is said upon the subject, as future, and attend to the consequence. For, if the sacrifice of the Phenicians was a type of another to come, the nature of this last will be known from the representation by which it was prefigured. According to this, *El*, the supreme Deity, whose associates were the *Elohim*, was in process of time to have a son; ἀγαπητὸν, well beloved; μονογενῆ, his only begotten: who was to be conceived, as some render it,[8] of *grace*, but according to my interpretation, of *the fountain of light*.

On this fragment of Sanchoniatho, see Goguet's *Orig. of Laws*, vol. i. pp. 370—384; Banier's *Mythology*, &c. vol. i. pp. 88—102; and particularly Boch. *Phaleg*. (*Opera*, tom. i. pp. 771—777.)

[5] It is to be noted, that Eusebius has given this account of the matter, in a passage different from that which I have already quoted from him. Λοιμοῦ δὲ γενομένου, καὶ φθορᾶς, τὸν ἑαυτοῦ μονογενῆ υἱὸν Κρόνος Οὐρανῷ πατρὶ ὁλοκαρποῖ. *Præp. Evang*. p. 38.

[6] Bryant here alludes to the circumstance of our not being possessed of Sanchoniatho's history itself, but merely of a fragment of a Greek translation of it by Philo Byblius, handed down to us by Eusebius; who, as well as the translator, appear to have mixed with the original some observations of their own.

[7] This seems a direct contradiction to what has been just before quoted from Eusebius. Bryant, however, explains this by shewing, that, in truth, *Ouranus*, the father, to whom *Kronus* is said to have offered up his only son, is the same as *El*, or *Elioun*, or *Kronus*, being only another title for the same person. This also he asserts to be the same with the Ἥλιος of the Greeks, and refers to Servius in Virg. *Æneid*, lib. i. de Belo Phœnice, "Omnes in illis partibus Solem colunt, qui ipsorum linguâ *Hel* dicitur." Bryant's *Observ*. &c. p. 290. Servius adds to this quotation from him by Bryant what deserves to be noticed: "Unde" (ex *Hel* scil.) "et Ἥλιος. Ergo additâ digamma, et in fine factâ derivatione a sole, Regi imposuit nomen *Beli*." This last formation by the digamma, Vossius however rejects. Belus, he says, came from Βῆλ, contracted from Βέελ, from which Βεελσαμην and other words. Voss. *de Idol*. lib. ii. cap. iv. tom. i. pp. 322, 323. See the whole of that chapter of Vossius.

[8] "I cannot help thinking that *Anobret* is the same as *Ouranus*; and however it may have been by the Greeks differently constructed, and represented as the name of a woman, yet it is reducible to the same elements with *Ouranus*; and is from the same radix, though differently modified. I take it to

He was to be called *Jeoud,*[9] whatever that name may relate to; and to be offered up as a sacrifice to his father, λύτρον, by way of satisfaction, and redemption, τιμωροῖς δαίμοσι, to atone for the sins of others, and avert the just vengeance of God; ἀντὶ τῆς πάντων φθορᾶς, to prevent universal corruption, and at the same time general ruin. And it is farther remarkable, he was to make this grand sacrifice, βασιλικῷ σχήματι κεκοσμημένος, "invested with the emblems of royalty." — These, surely, are very strong expressions; and the whole is an aggregate of circumstances highly significant, which cannot be the result of chance. All that I have requested to be allowed me in the process of this recital, is this simple supposition, that this mystical sacrifice was a type of something to come. How truly it corresponds to that which I imagine it alludes to, I submit to the reader's judgment. I think it must necessarily be esteemed a most wonderful piece of history." — Bryant's *Observations on various Parts of Ancient History,* pp. 286 — 292.

A most wonderful piece of history, undoubtedly, this must be confessed to be: and a most wonderful resemblance to the one great and final Sacrifice is it thus made to present to the view. One impediment, however, in the way of a full and entire assent to the conclusion of the learned writer, arises from the consideration, that if we suppose this mystical sacrifice of the Phenicians to have contained the typical allusion contended for, we must then admit, that among that most idolatrous and abandoned people (as we learn from the Scripture history the people of Canaan or Phenicia were,) a more exact delineation of the great future Sacrifice was handed down by tradition, than was at the same early age vouchsafed to the favoured nation of the Jews. The prophetic tradition, giving birth to the institution, had probably, Bryant observes, been preserved in the family of Esau, and so transmitted through his posterity to the people of Canaan. But was it not at least as likely that such a tradition would have been preserved in the family of Isaac, and so transmitted through his posterity to the people of the Jews? I am, upon the whole, therefore, rather disposed to think, that this sacrifice of the Phenicians grew out of the intended sacrifice of Isaac by Abraham, to which the circumstances of the history seem to correspond in many particulars.

First, it is remarkable, that the very name by which God describes Isaac, when he issues his order to Abraham to offer him in sacrifice, is יחיד,[10] *Jehid,* agreeing with the Phenician name *Jeud* given to the son of Kronus. Again, if *Anobret* has been justly explained by Bochart, as signifying "ex gratiâ concipiens," no epithet could be with greater propriety applied to Sara, the wife of Abraham; of whom the apostle says, "Through faith Sara received strength to conceive, — when she was past age." Again, that Abraham should be spoken of by the Phenicians, as a king who reigned in those parts, is not unlikely, considering his great possessions and rank[11] amongst the surrounding people: and if the name assigned by the history be actually *Israel,* or ʼΙλ, as the abbreviation of Israel, little doubt can then remain as to its application, there being nothing unreasonable (notwithstanding Vossius's remark noticed in p. 100.) in supposing him called by the title of the famous Patriarch whose progenitor he was, and from whom a whole people took its name. If even we should suppose the true reading to be *Il,* as equivalent to the *El* of the Hebrews, and so consider him as ranked amongst the divinities of the Phenicians, as the other parts of the history undoubtedly describe *Kronus* to have been, there is nothing in this so very surprising; especially when it is remembered, that *Kronus* is related to have been advanced from a mortal to the heavens. There is also an expression used of Arbaham in Gen. xxiii. 6, which, by a slight variation of the rendering, would actually represent him as a supreme God, in perfect correspondence with all that we have seen applied to *Kronus.* The expression I allude to is נשיא אלהים, which is strictly rendered a "prince of God," a known Hebraism for a *mighty* prince, as it is accordingly given in the common Bible, the literal English being placed in the margin. Now this might with equal accuracy (אלהים being a plural word) be rendered "a prince of Gods," and would accordingly, by those who held a plurality of Gods, as the Canaanites did, be so rendered: and thence he would come to be considered as supreme or chief among the gods. And accordingly we find the Elohim described as the associates of Kronus: Σύμμαχοί ʼΙλου τοῦ Κρόνου ʼΕλωεὶμ ἐπεκλήθησαν. (Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* p. 37.) But yet farther, another circumstance remains to be noticed, which seems to give confirmation to the idea, that Abraham was the *Kronus* of Sanchoniatho. We are told of Kronus by

---

have been originally *Ain Ober,* "the fountain of light," the word אור being rendered variously, *Aur, Aver, Aber, Ober.*" Now *Ouranus,* Bryant had before derived in like manner, making it the transposition of *Ain Aur* or *Our,* "the fountain of light;" written *Our ain,* and thence by the Greeks *Ouranos.* Bryant's *Observ.* &c. pp. 285, 291. Bochart, however, derives the word *Anobret* differently: thus, חן־עוברת, *An-oberet,* i. e. ex gratiâ concipiens: which, he says, is a just appellation for Sara, the wife of Abraham. — Boch. *Phal.* (*Opera,* tom. i. p. 712.)

[9] The Hebrew word יחיד, *Jehid,* signifies unicus, solitarius, and is frequently applied to an only son. It is the very word used of Isaac in Gen. xxii. 2.

[10] "Take now thy son, (יחידך,) thine only son." Gen. xxii. 2.

[11] See Gen. xxiii. 6, where Abraham is addressed as a king. "Thou art a mighty prince among us."

this writer (*Præp. Ev.* p. 38.) that he was the author of the rite of circumcision. *Καὶ τὰ αἰδοῖα περιτέμνεται ταυτὸ ποιῆσαι καὶ τοὺς ἅμ' αὐτῷ συμμάχους καταναγκάσας;* Etiam pudenda sibi ipse circumcidit, sociosque omnes ad simile factum per vim adigit. This exactly corresponds to what is said of Abraham, in Gen. xvii. 27. — See Stilling. *Orig. Sacr.* pp. 371, 372; Shuckford's *Connection*, i. pp. 326, 327; and particularly Bochart *Phaleg.* tom. i. pp. 711, 712.

Thus, upon the whole, it appears to me, that the reference of the *mystical sacrifice* of the Phenicians to the intended sacrifice of Isaac by Abraham is natural[12] and striking. Nor, perhaps, after all, do I, in holding this opinion, differ very substantially from the learned Mr Bryant; inasmuch as that intended sacrifice is acknowledged to have been typical of a great sacrifice to come; and it may reasonably be supposed, that a tradition[13] of its *mystical* nature would pass down through the branches of the Abrahamic family, and so by the line of Esau descend to the inhabitants of the land of Canaan. And thus, eventually, the Phenician sacrifice, founded upon the typical sacrifice of Isaac, would derive from that, a relation to the great offering of which it was the model; and from its correspondence with the type, acquire that correspondence with the thing typified, for which Mr Bryant contends, but in a form more direct.

Thus, then, in this mystical sacrifice of the Phenicians, which, taken in all its parts, is certainly the most remarkable that history records amongst the heathen nations, we find, notwithstanding the numerous fictions and corruptions that disturb the resemblance, marked and obvious traces of a rite originating in the divine command (as the intended sacrifice of Isaac indisputably was,) and terminating in that one grand and comprehensive offering, which was the primary object and the final consummation of the sacrificial institution.

No. XLII. — Page 15. Col. 2.

ON THE DEATH OF CHRIST AS A TRUE PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE FOR THE SINS OF MANKIND.

Not only are the sacrificial terms of the law applied to the death of Christ, as has been shewn in Numbers XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX; but others, which open up more fully the true nature of atonement, are superadded in the description of that great sacrifice, as possessing, in truth and reality, that expiatory virtue, which the sacrifices of the law but relatively enjoyed, and but imperfectly reflected. Reasonable as this seems, and arising out of the very nature of the case, yet has it not failed to furnish matter of cavil to disputatious criticism: the very want of those expressions, which in strictness could belong only to the true propitiatory sacrifice of

---

[12] This application of the history of Sanchoniatho (as reported by Eusebius) to the circumstances of the birth and intended sacrifice of Isaac recorded by Moses, will appear yet more satisfactory to him who will take the trouble of consulting either Stillingfleet or Bochart, on the whole of the Phenician Theogony, as derived from Sanchoniatho. Those writers abundantly prove, that the particulars of that Theogony are borrowed from the facts referred to in the Mosaic history, and its various fables founded upon the mistake or perversion of the language of the Hebrew records. — Stilling. *Orig. Sacr.* pp. 368—372. Boch. *Phal. Opera*, tom. i. pp. 704—712. See also Banier's *Myth.* vol. i. pp. 88—101; and Goguet's *Origin of Laws*, &c. vol. i. pp. 370—384. President Kirwan likewise, in a learned paper *On the Origin of Polytheism*, &c. (in the eleventh volume of the *Trans. of the Royal Irish Acad.*) has treated of this subject. Some of these writers, indeed, particularly Goguet, have doubted whether Sanchoniatho was acquainted with the sacred books. But to the main point with which we are concerned, it seems to be of little consequence whether the facts, as they are reported by Moses, or the general tradition of those facts, formed the groundwork of the Phenician mythology.

It should be noted, that Bishop Cumberland, in his *Sanchoniatho*, pp. 134—150, maintains an opinion, directly repugnant to that which has been advanced in this Number, on the subject of the Phenician sacrifice. But it must be observed, that the learned Bishop's arguments are founded on the want of a perfect agreement between the particulars of Abraham's history, and those of Kronus as detailed by Sanchoniatho: whereas nothing more ought to be expected in such a case, than that vague and general resemblance, which commonly obtains between truth and the fabulous representation of it. Of such resemblance the features will be found, in the instance before us, to be marked with peculiar strength. But the fear of tracing the idolatrous practices of the Phenicians, especially that most horrid practice of human sacrifice, to the origin of a divine command, rendered this excellent prelate the less quick-sighted in discovering such similitude. Indeed, the professed object for which he entered upon his Review of Sanchoniatho's history, must in a great degree detract from the value of his researches upon that subject. The account given by his biographer and panegyrist Mr Payne, states of him, that "he detested nothing so much as Popery, was affected with the apprehensions of it to the last degree, and was jealous almost to an excess of every thing that he suspected to favour it: that this depravation of Christianity ran much in his thoughts, and the inquiry how religion came at first to degenerate into idolatry, put him upon the searches that produced the work in question; inasmuch as the oldest account of idolatry he believed was to be found in Sanchoniatho's fragment; and as leading to the discovery of the original of idolatry, he accordingly made it the subject of his study. *Preface to* Cumb. *Sanch.* pp. x. xxviii. With a preconceived system, and a predominant terror, even the mind of Cumberland was not likely to pursue a steady and unbiassed course. The melancholy prospect of affairs in the reign of James the Second, his biographer remarks, had inspired him with extraordinary horrors.

[13] Were we to accept of Bishop Warburton's idea of the scenical nature of the intended sacrifice of Isaac, representing by action, instead of words, the future sacrifice of Christ, (whose day, as that writer urges, Abraham was by this enabled to see,) we might here positively pronounce, that a precise notion of that future sacrifice did actually exist in the time of Abrabam: and that a foundation for the tradition was thus laid in an anticipated view of that great event. But without going so far as this ingenious writer would lead us, may it not fairly be presumed, that in some manner or other, that patriarch, who enjoyed frequent communication with the Deity, was favoured with the knowledge of the general import of this mysterious transaction, and that from him there passed to his immediate descendants the notion of a mysterious reference at least, if not of the exact nature of its object? On this subject, see Warb. *Div. Leg.* ii. pp. 539—614; and Stebbing's *Examination of Warburton*, pp. 137—149; and his *History of Abraham.*

Christ, being made a ground of objection against the propitiatory nature of the Mosaic atonement. Of this we have already seen an instance in page 94, with respect to the words[1] λύτρον, and ἀντίλυτρον. The expression, *bearing sin*, furnishes another: the author of the *Scripture Account of Sacrifices* (p. 146.), urging the omission of this phrase in the case of the legal sacrifices, as an argument against the vicarious nature of the Levitical atonement.

Such arguments, however, only recoil upon the objectors, inasmuch as they supply a reluctant testimony in favour of the received sense of these expressions, when applied to that sacrifice to which they properly appertained. But from this these critics seem to entertain no apprehension: and their mode of reasoning is certainly a bold exercise of logic. From the want of such expressions, as being of vicarious import, they conclude against the vicarious nature of the Mosaic sacrifices; and, this point gained, they return, and triumphantly conclude against the vicarious import of these expressions in that sacrifice to which they are applied. Not to disturb these acute reasoners in the enjoyment of their triumph, let us consider whether the terms employed in describing the death of Christ, as a propitiatory sacrifice, be sufficiently precise and significant to remove all doubt with respect to its true nature and operation.

To enumerate the various passages of Scripture, in which the death of Christ is represented to have been a *sacrifice*, and the effect of this sacrifice to have been strictly *propitiatory*, must lead to a prolix detail, and is the less necessary in this place, as most of them are to be found occasionally noticed in the course of this inquiry; especially in p. 61. and Numbers XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII. There are some, however, which, as throwing a stronger light upon the nature and import of the Christian sacrifice, demand our most particular attention; and the more so, because, from their decisive testimony in favour of the received doctrine of atonement, the utmost stretch of ingenuity has been exerted to weaken their force, and divert their application. Of these, the most distinguished is the description of the sufferings and death of Christ, in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. We there find this great personage represented as one, on whom "the Lord hath laid the iniquity of us all;" as one, who "was numbered with transgressors, and bare the sins of many;" as one, who consequently "was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities;" and who, in "making his soul an (אשם) offering for sin," suffered "the chastisement of our peace, and healed us by his stripes." Thus we have, here, a clear and full explanation of the nature and efficacy of the sacrifice offered for us by our blessed Redeemer. And as this part of Scripture not only seems designed to disclose the whole scheme and essence of the Christian atonement, but, from the frequent and familiar references made to it by the writers in the New Testament, appears to be recognzied by them as furnishing the true basis of its exposition, it becomes necessary to examine, with scrupulous attention, the exact force of the expressions, and the precise meaning of the prophet. For this purpose, I shall begin with laying before the reader the last nine verses of the chapter, as they are rendered by Bishop Lowth in his admirable translation, with the readings of the ancient versions, and some occasional explanations by Vitringa, Dathe, and other expositors.

4. Surely our infirmities he hath borne:[2]
And our sorrows he hath [A] carried[3] them:
Yet we thought him judicially stricken;
Smitten of God and afflicted.
5. But he was wounded for our transgressions;
Was smitten for our iniquities:
The chastisement, [B] by which our peace is effected, was laid upon him;
And by his bruises we are healed.
6. We all of us like sheep have strayed:
We have turned aside, every one to his own way;
And Jehovah hath made to light [C] upon him the iniquity of us all.
7. It was exacted, [D] and he was made answerable; and he opened not his mouth:
As a lamb that is led to the slaughter;
And as a sheep before her shearers
Is dumb: so he opened not his mouth.
8. By an oppressive judgment he was taken off;
And his manner of life who would declare?
For he was cut off from the land of the living;
For [E] the transgression of my people he was smitten to death.
9. And his grave, &c.
Although he had done no wrong,
Neither was there any guile in his mouth.
10. Yet it pleased Jehovah to crush him with affliction.
If his soul shall make a propitiatory sacrifice, [F]
He shall see a seed, &c.
11. Of [G] the travail of his soul he shall see (the fruit,) and be satisfied.
By the knowledge of him shall my servant justify [H] many;
For the punishment of their iniquities he shall [I] bear.[4]
12. Therefore will I distribute to him the many for his portion.
And the mighty people shall he share for his spoil:
Because he poured out his soul unto death;
And was numbered with the transgressors:
And he [K] bare[5] the sin of many:
And made intercession for the transgressors.

---

[1] In addition to what has been already offered upon the meaning of these words, I beg to refer the reader to the judicious observations in Dr Nares's *Remarks on the Version of the New Testament by the Unitarians*, pp. 125—130; and to those of Danzius, in his treatise De ΛΥΤΡΩι. Meusch. *Nov. Test. ex Talm.* pp. 869, 870.

[2] נשא. [3] סבל. [4] סבל. [5] נשא.

A (*Carried.*) Bajulavit. Vitr.—Sustinet. Dath. and Doederl.—τοὺς πόνους ὑπέμεινε. Symm.—also Aq. and Theod.—See *Crit. Sac.* tom. iv. p. 5306.

B (*Chastisement.*) Pœna exemplaris ad impetrandam nobis reconciliationem cum Deo. Vitr.—Ejus castigatio nostræ cum Deo reconciliationis causa facta est. Dath.—Mulcta correctionis nostræ ei imposita fuit. Tig.—מוסר. pœna publica ad deterrendos spectantes a peccando, exemplo pœnarum, ut Ezek. v. 15. Gusset. *Lex.* p. 332. Pœna exemplaris, quâ alius moneatur et cohibeatur a peccando. Παράδειγμα. Cocc. *Lex.*—Michaelis (*in loc.*) likewise supplies many authorities in support of the translation given by Lowth and Vitringa. — Castigatio salutis nostræ super ipsum, patet esse sensus verborum ex iis quæ sequuntur, ובחברתו נרפא לנו plaga sua curatio nobis fit, dum ille insons acerbissimos dolores sustinuit, nos sontes a peccatorum pœnis liberi manebamus, quasi Jehova ipsi nostrorum peccatorum pœnas luendas imposuerit. Rosenm.—N.B. the LXX version, παιδεία, which seems the principal ground of Mr Dodson's objection to the Bishop's translation, supplies no argument against it, inasmuch as this expression is frequently used by the LXX in the sense here contended for: see Lev. xxvi. 18, 23, 28; Deut. xi. 2; xxi. 18; xxii. 18; 1 Kings, xii. 11, 14; 2 Chr. x. 11, 14; Psal. vi. 1; xxxviii. 1; xxxix. 11; cxviii. 18; Prov. iii. 11; xiii. 24; xix. 18; xxii. 15; Isa. xxvi. 16; Jer. ii. 19, 30; v. 3; x. 24; xxx. 11, 14; xxxi. 18; xlvi. 28; Ezek. v. 15; xxiii. 48; Wisd. iii. 5; Hos. vii. 12. These passages, in which the words παιδεία, and παιδεύω, are used by the LXX to express the Hebrew מוסר, and יסר, are all instances of their application in the sense of *chastisement:* to these there might be added many examples of the Greek word, used in this sense, from the book of Ecclesiasticus; and we find one passage in the book of Job, (xxxvii. 13.) in which the Greek translator has employed the word παιδεία, as expressive of the Hebrew שבט, a *rod;* so familiarly did they connect with it the notion of correction. The word is also frequently used in this sense by the writers of the New Testament: see Schleusn. *Lex.* on παιδεία and παιδεύω.

C (*Made to light upon him the iniquity of us all.*) Fecit incurrere in ipsum pœnam iniquitatis omnium nostrum. Vitr.—Jova ab eo exegit pœnam peccatorum nostrorum omnium. Dath.—Καὶ Κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν, is the present reading of the LXX: and the Old Italic as given by Augustin, as well as the several readings collected by Sabatier, follow this very nearly: rendering it, "Dominus eum tradidit propter iniquitates nostras:" but Symm. corresponds with the received reading, Κύριος καταντῆσαι ἐποίησεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὴν ἀνομίαν πάντων ἡμῶν. The Syriac reads, Dominus fecit ut occurrerent in eum peccata nostra. The Vulgate, Dominus fecit occurrere in eum iniquitatem omnium nostrûm: and Castellio, Jova in eum omnium nostrûm crimen conjecit. Crellius, indeed, to avoid the force of this clause, translates it, Deum, per Christum, iniquitati omnium nostrûm occurrisse: and is refuted by Outram, lib. ii. cap. v. § 3. Rosenmüller renders the words, incursare in eum jussit crimina nostrûm omnium, h. e. pœnas impietati nostræ debitas illum unice perferre jussit Jehova. And upon the whole of the 4th, 5th, and 6th verses, he gives this general exposition: Quem nos ob sua crimina atrocissimis malis a Deo affectum existimavimus, illum eos dolores sustinuisse nunc intelligimus, qui nobis pro peccatis subeundi fuerunt.

D (*It was exacted.*) Exigebatur debitum. Vitr.—Exactionem sustinuit, vel solutio exacta fuit. Michaelis.—Exigitur debitum, et ille ad diem respondit. Dath.—Mr Dodson seems, upon very slender grounds, to object to Bishop Lowth's translation of this clause. Dr Taylor having, in his Concordance, pronounced the word נגש, to be a forensic term, signifying, he was "brought forth," and Symmachus having rendered it by the word προσηνέχθη, appear but weak reasons for deciding this point: especially as the word προσηνέχθη might have been used by Symm. in the sacrificial sense, in which it so frequently occurs: and that it was so in this instance, is highly probable from the rendering of the Vulgate; "oblatus est,—he was offered:"—and though this does not come up to the Bishop's idea, yet still less does it favour that which Mr Dodson has adduced it to support. For the numerous and weighty arguments, supporting the Bishop's translation of the word נגש, see Vitr. and Poole's *Syn.*—see also Calasio's *Concord.* where under Number II. not less than twenty-one passages are cited, which coincide with this application of the word. One authority more I shall only add: it is that of the Jews themselves, who allow that נגש signifies, to "demand rigorously what is due." Of this see a strong proof in the words of Kimchi, quoted in White's *Comm. on Isaiah.*

E (*For.*) It is curious to observe the way in which Mr Dodson, who, in his note on verse 11, charges the Bishop with "early prejudices and an undue attachment to established systems," has laboured to distort the obvious meaning of this passage, manifestly in support of a system, though not an established one. "*For* the wickedness of my people," he would translate "*through* the wickedness," &c. upon little better grounds than that it may be so translated: for as to the authority of the LXX, rendering the preposition מ by ἀπὸ, which is his principal argument, it yields him no support; the word ἀπὸ being frequently used in the sense of *propter*, as is satisfactorily shewn by Schleusner (*Lex.* Number 17.) who cites several instances to prove it, and amongst them (Ex. vi. 9; Deut. vii. 7; Prov. xx. 4; Nah. iii. 11,) evincing its agreement with the preposition מ in this respect: to the same purport see Biel's *Lexic. in LXX*, on the word: and accordingly, ἀπὸ is in this very place translated *ob*, by Procopius; (*Crit. Sac.* vol. iv. p. 5300.) and Sym. renders the words by ΔΙΑ τὴν ἀδικίαν. But, that the word does in this place imply *propter*, the antecedent and impulsive cause, is not only fully proved by Vitringa, and Poole on verse 5, (see also Nold. *Concord.* p. 467,) but is even admitted by Crellius in his *Answer to Grotius*, p. 25. Nay, what is more, Mr Dodson himself has, in verse 5, allowed to the very same expression which occurs here מפשע, the signification which in this place he refuses to it; translating with the bishop and the other commentators, "he was wounded for our transgressions." Perhaps prejudice and attachment to system may sometimes stray beyond the pale of the establishment: and tempting as those emoluments may appear, which an established church has to bestow, (Dods. *Let. to Dr Sturges*, p. 24.) there may be passions which influence the human breast with a sway not less powerful than that of avarice. I say not this from disrespect to Mr Dodson, whose well-meant, and in many respects ably executed, plan of reconciling the distinguished prophet of the old with the writers of the New Testament, deserves well of every friend of Christianity. But on most occasions, it may not be amiss to consider, whether prejudice may not lie at more than one side of a question, and whether he who is animated by an ardent spirit of opposition to established opinions, may not be influenced (though perhaps unconsciously) by other feelings than a love of truth.

F On this clause see Number XXVII ; and in addition to the observations there offered upon the passage, I would recommend to the learned reader the copious discussion of its structure and meaning by Danzius in his treatise *De* ΛΥΤΡΩι, Meusch. *Nov. Test. Ex. Talm.* pp. 851—854.

G (*Of.*) In this, the Bishop (as well as Mr Dodson, and our present English version,) departs from the uniformity of the preposition מ throughout this entire section. *Propter* laborem animæ suæ videbit. Vitr.—*Propter* has quas perpessus est afflictiones. Dath.—*Propter* labores ipsius. Rosenm.—So Crellius himself explains the word, in his *Answer to Grotius*, p. 25.—The LXX version of this book, which (as has been already observed in p. 63, and is admitted also by Mr Dodson, pref. p. vii.) is in many parts erroneous and even absurd,—and from which, Vitringa remarks on verse 11, "but little aid is to be looked for in this book," (see also the testimony of Zuinglius in Glass. *Phil. Sac.* continued by Bauer, p. 250,)—is here totally unintelligible ; but the Vulgate renders the clause, *pro eo* quod laboravit anima ejus : and the Doway, agreeably to this, translates, "*for that* his soul has laboured," &c.—in which it has the advantage of the Protestant English versions.

H (*Justify.*) Justitiam adferet multis. Vitr.—Justificationem conciliabit multis. Cocc.—Justitiam dabit multis ; *i. e.* justificabit multos. Michael.—Justificabit ipse multos. Vulg.—Mr Dodson, indeed, renders it, "turn many to righteousness ;" and quotes the authority of Taylor's *Concord.* and Dan. xii. 3. He cites Grotius also, who on this occasion is the less to be attended to, as he most unaccountably applies the prophecy to Jeremiah, so as to render this sense of the word unavoidable. See Vitr. particularly on this word.—Cloppenb. asserts, that the most usual signification of the word הצדיק, as of the Greek δικαιόω, is, to *absolve*, to *acquit*; see Poole's *Syn.* Justification, he says, is opposed to *condemnation*, and is a forensic term, signifying *acquittal*. Albert, on Rom. viii. 33, (*Observ. Phil.*) says of δικαιόω, it is a forensic term, implying a declaration of acquittal of the person charged with any crime, and answers to the word הצדיק. Parkhurst in like manner explains it as being a forensic term, implying to absolve from past offences, and corresponding to הצידק, for which, he says, the LXX have used it in this sense, in Deut. xxv. 1 ; 1 Kings, viii. 32 ; 2 Chron. vi. 23 ; Isa. v. 23.—he might have added Exod. xxiii. 7 ; Psal. lxxxii. 3 ; Prov. xvii. 15 ; and many others which may be collected from Trommius and Calasio. The passage last referred to, places *justification* (הצדיק, δικαιόω,) in direct opposition to *condemnation* :—"he that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are an abomination to the Lord."—Isai. l. 8. supplies a strong example of the same opposition. See also Schleusner on δικαιόω, which, corresponding to צדק. is used, he says, "in a forensic sense ; and signifies to be acquitted, to be pronounced innocent, and is put in opposition to καταδικάζεσθαι ;" of which he furnishes several instances.

I (*For the punishment of their iniquities he shall bear.*) Siquidem eorum peccata bajulavit. Vitr.—Nam pro peccatis eorum satisfecit. Dath.—Nam pœnas eorum sustinuit. Doederl.—Et iniquitates eorum ipse portabit. Vulg.—Peccata illorum ipse sustinebit. Old Italic as given by August. Sabat. in loc.—Mr Dodson contends against the propriety of the bishop's translation, and maintains, that the words will bear no other meaning than, "their iniquities he shall *bear away*." In this he considers himself supported by the authority of the LXX, who render, Καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ΑΝΟΙΣΕΙ. He does not, however, state, that Sym. translates the clause, τὰς ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ΥΠΕΝΕΓΚΕΙ : (*Crit. Sac.* tom. iv. p. 5300.)—and besides, as we shall see hereafter, the word ἀναφέρω yields him no support. Bishop Stock renders, "Of their iniquities he shall *bear the weight* :" in which he agrees with Rosenmüller, who says, "De formula hac bene monuit Martini, peccata propter mala, quæ sibi adjuncta habent, ab Orientalibus ut grave onus repræsentari, quo premantur, qui iis se inquinaverint, in cujus rei testimonium adducit locum Thren. v. 7. et ex Corano plura loca. Hinc apud Arabes, inquit, verbum, quod proprie est, grave onus sustinuit, dicitur pro, crimine gravatus fuit : itemque sarcina vocabulum solenne est de criminibus eorumque pœnis."

K (*He bare*, &c.) Peccatum multorum tulit. Vitr.—Pro multorum peccatis satisfecit. Dath.—Multorum pœnas sustinuit. Doederl.—Peccata multorum tulit. Vulg.—Peccata multorum sustinuit. August.—pertulit. Cypr.—and both add, after the LXX, et propter iniquitates eorum traditus est : Sabat. in loc.—Mr Dodson objects, as in verse 11, and renders it, he *took away* the sins, &c.

I have thought it necessary to take this accurate survey of this celebrated prophecy, and to state thus fully the various renderings of the most respectable versions and commentators, lest any pretence might remain, that, in deriving my arguments from this part of Scripture, I had, either unguardedly, or uncandidly, built on any inaccuracy in our common English translation. The plain result of the whole is obviously this : That the righteous servant of Jehovah, having no sin himself, was to submit to be treated as the vilest of sinners ; and, having the burden of our transgressions laid upon him, to suffer on account of them ; and, by offering up his life a propitiatory sacrifice, like to those under the law, to procure for us a release from the punishment which was due to our offences. And thus from that prophet, justly called Evangelical, who was the first commissioned to lift up the veil that covered the mystery of our redemption, and to draw it forth to open view from beneath the shade of Jewish ceremonies and types, through which it had been hitherto but faintly discerned,—we have a description of that great propitiatory Sacrifice, whereby our salvation has been effected, as plain as it is possible for language to convey it. That Christ is the person described by the prophet throughout this chapter, cannot with any Christian be a matter of question. Saint Matthew, (viii. 17,) and Saint Peter, (1 Ep. ii. 24,) directly recognize the prophecy as applied to Christ: and yet more decisive is the passage in Acts, (viii. 35) in which, the eunuch reading this very chapter, and demanding of Philip, "of whom speaketh the prophet this?" it is said, that "Philip began at the same Scripture, and preached unto him Jesus."

Indeed, so evident and undeniable is the application to Christ, that Dr Priestley himself, whilst he is laboriously employed in withdrawing from the support of Christianity most of the prophecies of the Old Testament (which, he says, Christians, by "following too closely the writers of the New Testament," have been erroneously led to attribute to Christ, *Theol. Rep.* vol. v. p. 213,) yet pronounces it impossible to explain this of any other but Jesus Christ, (p. 226;) and considers the application of it to Jeremiah by Grotius as not deserving a refutation. White also, who, in his *Commentary on Isaiah*, professes to follow Grotius as his oracle, is yet obliged to abandon him in his explication of this prophecy, which he says cannot possibly belong to any other than Christ: and this he thinks so evident, that he concurs with A. Lapide, in pronouncing that "this chapter may justly challenge for its title, 'The Passion of Jesus Christ according to Isaiah.'" See also Kennicott's *Dissert.* vol. ii. p. 373.

But, whilst Christ is of necessity allowed to be the subject of this prophecy, the propitiatory sacrifice, which he is here represented as offering for the sins of men, is utterly rejected. And for the purpose of doing away the force of the expressions, which so clearly convey this idea, the adversaries of the doctrine of atonement have directed against this part of Scripture their principal attacks. What has been already advanced in Number XXVII. may shew how impotent have been their attempts to prove that Christ is not here described, as an אשם, or "sacrifice for sin." And their endeavours to evince that this sacrifice is not likewise described as one truly *propitiatory*, we shall find to be equally unsupported by just argument, or fair and rational criticism.

The usual method of proceeding has been, to single out one expression from this entire passage, and, by undermining its signification, to shake the whole context into ruins. The person, who is made an אשם, or "sin-offering," is said to "bear the sins of many." Now, it is contended, that to *bear* sins, signifies merely to bear them away, or remove them; and that, consequently, nothing more is meant here, than "the removing away from us our sins and iniquities by forgiveness."[6] In support of this position, the application of the prophet's words by Saint Matthew, (viii. 17,) and the force of the expressions which in this prophecy are rendered by the words, *bearing* sins, are urged as unanswerable arguments.

1. It is said, that "the words in the 4th verse, 'our infirmities he hath borne, and our sorrows, he hath carried them,' are expressly interpreted by Saint Matthew, of the miraculous cures performed by our Saviour on the sick: and as the *taking* our infirmities, and *bearing* our sicknesses, cannot mean the *suffering* those infirmities and sicknesses, but only the *bearing them away*, or *removing* them, so the bearing our iniquities is likewise to be understood, as removing them away from us by forgiveness."

It must be owned, that this passage of Saint Matthew has given great difficulty to commentators. His applying, what the prophet seems to say of sins, to bodily infirmities; and the *bearing* of the former, to the *curing* of the latter; has created no small degree of perplexity. Some have, accordingly, contended,[7] that Saint Matthew has applied the prophecy merely in accommodation; in which case, he supplies no authority as to the precise meaning of the words of the prophet: others[8] again, that the expressions admit that full and comprehensive signification, that will include both bodily and spiritual diseases, and which consequently received a twofold fulfilment: others[9] again, that Christ might be said to have *suffered* the diseases, which he removed; from the anxious care, and bodily harassing, with which he laboured to remedy them, bearing them, as it were, through sympathy and toil: and Bishop Pearce is so far dissatisfied with all of these expositions, that he is led to concede the probability, that the passage in Matthew is an interpolation. Now, if these several commentators, acquiescing in the received, have proceeded on an erroneous, acceptation of the passages in Isaiah and Matthew, we shall have little reason to wonder at the difficulties which they have had to encounter in reconciling the prophet and the evangelist. It must surely, then, be worth our while to try whether a closer examination of the original passages will not enable us to effect this point.

For this purpose, it must first be observed, that all the commentators have gone upon the supposition, that the prophet, in the 4th verse, which is that quoted by Saint Matthew, speaks only of the sufferings of Christ on account of our sins: into which they have been led, partly by the Greek version, ἁμαρτίας; and partly by the supposition, that Saint Peter refers to this same passage, when he speaks of Christ's "bearing our *sins* upon the cross." But the reference of Saint Peter is not to this 4th verse, but to the 11th and 12th: the words of Saint Peter, *τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκε*, corresponding to the original in both these verses, and being the very same used by the LXX: *τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει*, and *αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας, ἀνήνεγκε* being their translation of them respectively. Again, with regard to the word, *ἁμαρτίας*, which is now found in the Greek version of the 4th verse, there seems little reason to doubt, from what Dr Kennicott has advanced, in his *Diss. Gen.* § 79, that this is a corruption, which has crept into the later copies of the Greek; the old Italic, as (collected from Augustin, Tertullian, and Athanasius,) as well as Saint Matthew, reading the word, *ἀσθενείας*, and thereby proving the early state of that version. Besides, Dr Owen (*Modes of Quot.* p. 31.) mentions two MSS. that read at this day *ἀσθενείας*; and one *μαλακίας*: and from the collection in which the late Dr Holmes was engaged, if happily it should be prosecuted, it is not unlikely that more may appear to justify this reading. I find, also, that in ninety-three instances, in which the word here translated *ἁμαρτία*, or its kindred verb, is found in the Old Testament in any sense that is not entirely foreign from the passage before us, there occurs but this one in which the word is so rendered; it being, in all other cases, expressed by *ἀσθένεια, μαλακία*, or some word denoting bodily disease. See Calas. *Conc.* on חלה, No. 1. That the Jews themselves considered this passage of Isaiah as referring to bodily diseases, appears from Whitby, and Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. viii. 17. and also Poole's *Syn.* on Isaiah liii. 4. *Pes.* and *Alsch.* And that the word חלינו is to be taken in this sense, appears not only from the authority of the Jews, but from that of most of the ancient translations; being rendered by Munster and the Tigurine, *infirmitates;* and *morbos*, by Tremellius, Piscator, and Castalio. — Iren. and August. who give us the early Latin version from the Greek, read *infirmitates;* and Tertullian, *imbecillitates.* Coccius, and all the lexicons, explain it in the same sense; and the several passages in which it occurs in the Old Testament, as collected both by Taylor and Calasio, place the matter beyond dispute. So that the word *infirmities*, by which Lowth, and Vitringa, in agreement with the old English versions, have rendered it in this place, cannot possibly be rejected. Mr Dodson entirely concurs in this interpretation; and Kennicott asserts positively, that the word always denotes *bodily diseases.* (*Diss. Gen.* § 79.) Dathe, and Doederlein, indeed, explain it by the general expressions, *mala*, and *miseriam;* but Doederlein at the same time admits that *morbus* is its literal signification.

---

[6] *B. Mord.* p. 825. See also Taylor's *Key*, No. 162.; Mr Dodson's Notes on this chapter of Isaiah; and particularly Crell. *Resp. ad Grot.* p. 24, &c.

[7] See Calixt. Ernest. *Schol. Proph.* p. 230. Sykes's *Essay on Christ. Rel.* p. 231. Beausob. Rosenm. and Wakefield, *in loc.*

[8] See Hamm. Whitby, Le Clerc, and Lightfoot, *in loc.*

[9] See Vitr. on Isa. liii. 4, & Raphel. Grot. & Doddridge, *in loc*

Having thus ascertained the true sense of the word חלינו, we next proceed to נשא; which, I agree with Mr Dodson, is not here to be rendered in any other sense, than that of *tollo, aufero.* This, when not connected with *sins, iniquities*, &c. is not infrequently its signification. Dr Kennicott (*Diss. Gen.* § 79.) takes it in this place in the sense of *abstulit;* and thus Tertullian expressly reads the word from the early Latin. So that the first clause, חלינו הוא נשא, will then run, "surely our infirmities he hath taken, *i. e.* taken away," exactly corresponding to Saint Matthew's translation and application of the words: and thus Cocc. (on נשא, N°. I.) expressly renders it, "Morbos nostros ipse tulit, *i. e.* ferens abstulit."

But the second, or antithetical clause, ומכאבינו סבלם, relates, as we shall see, not to bodily pains and distempers, but to the diseases and torments of the mind. That the word מכאב is to be taken in this sense, Kennicott affirms. (*Diss Gen.* § 79.) It is evidently so interpreted, Psal. xxxii. 10, "Many *sorrows* shall be to the wicked:" and again, Psal. xxxviii. 17. where the Psalmist, grieving for his sins, says, "My *sorrow* is continually before me:" and again, Psal. lxix. 29. "But I am poor and *sorrowful:*" and again in Prov. xiv. 13. "The heart is *sorrowful:*" and Eccles. i. 18. "He that increaseth knowledge, increaseth *sorrow:*" and ii. 18. "What hath man of all his labour, of the vexation of his heart? For all his days are *sorrows:*" and Isa. lxv. 14. "My servants shall sing for joy, but ye shall cry for *sorrow* of heart:" and Jer. xxx. 15. "Thy *sorrow* is incurable, for the multitude of thine iniquity." Agreeably to this, the word is translated by Bishop Lowth, and by our common and most of the early English versions, *sorrows.* The Vulg. Vitr. and Dath. render it by *dolores;* and the LXX by *ὀδυνᾶται.* — *Πόνος*, which is the word used by Sym.[10] Aquil. and Theod. (see Procop. *Crit. Sac.* tom. iv. pp. 5299, 5300,) agrees with this, signifying, according to Hesychius, *ἄλγος ἐνέργημα ὀδύνης*, and being used commonly in this sense in the Greek of the Old Testament. Yet, in opposition to all this Mr Dodson contends, that the Hebrew word is here to be rendered *sicknesses:* and this, upon no better ground, than that the word may signify bodily disorders, as well as diseases of the mind: and in support of this assertion, he refers to Taylor's *Concordance.* But, on consulting both Taylor and Calasio,

---

[10] Symmachus renders, *τοὺς πόνους ὑπέμεινε*; as see p. 105 of this volume. It is observable, that the rendering of the word מכאב, in this place, by ΠΟΝΟΣ, in the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, has been omitted in Trommius's *Concordance*, in the *Lexicon Græcum ad Hexapla*, in Biel's *Lexicon in LXX.* &c. and in Schleusner's *Spicilegium*, intended as an addition to the Lexicon of Biel. Trommius, indeed, notices this rendering of the word כאב by Symmachus in Job, xvi. 6, and xxxiii. 19; and of the word עמל by Aquila in Job, xvi. 2, and by both Aquila and Symmachus in Psalm xiv. But none of these instances have been cited by Biel. A complete Concordance for the fragments of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, seems still a desideratum.

I find, that of about thirty passages of Scripture, in which, exclusive of the one at present before us, the word מכאב or its kindred verb is found, there is scarcely one that bears any relation whatever to bodily disease:[11] and there is but one, (Job, xxxiii. 19,) in which the LXX have rendered it by any word implying corporeal ailment. In this one place they have used the word μαλακία, which, however, they do not always apply to bodily disease; and which they have employed in the 3d verse of this very chapter, εἰδὼς φέρειν μαλακίαν, where Mr Dodson renders the words, "acquainted with *grief*." But it is particularly worthy of remark, that this word מכאבים, which Mr Dodson in this 4th verse would translate *sicknesses*, he has himself rendered in the preceding verse, in the description to which this immediately refers, by the word *sorrows*, and yet pronounces this expression utterly inapplicable here: thus allowing the person spoken of, to be "a man of sorrows," in one verse; and denying that the same expression, which was there used, referred to those *sorrows*, in the next, where it came to be explained what and whence these sorrows were.

The secret, however, of this inconsistency of criticism lies in the Hebrew verb, annexed to this word.—The verb סבל, "to bear," in the sense of *bearing a burden*, could not be applied to *sicknesses*, as it might to *sorrows*: and as the object with those who deny that Christ suffered on our account, is to deprive the verb of this signification, the reason of contending for the adjunct *sickness*, in opposition to such a weight of evidence, is sufficiently obvious. The word, סבל, however, Mr Dodson cannot prove to be taken here in the sense of *removing*. He says, "it has been already proved by many learned men," and refers to Crellius, Whiston, and Taylor. But in what manner these learned men have proved it, we shall presently see. In his answer to Dr Sturges, p. 21, he advances, indeed, his own reasons in defence of his exposition of the word סבל: but except the citation from Isa. xlvi. 4, which shall be noticed hereafter, his whole argument turns upon the supposition, that the Hebrew word, with which it is connected, as well as its corresponding expression in Saint Matthew, is to be understood as signifying bodily disorders: in which case he says, "סבל must be considered as synonymous to נשא." All this, then, together with the accompanying remark concerning the use of the word ἐβάστασεν by Hippocrates, must fall with the hypothesis on which it is built; and the strength of this hypothesis has been now sufficiently ascertained.

But, to proceed with the verb סבל. The word, or its derivative noun, occurs in twenty-six passages of the Old Testament, one of which is the verse now under examination: two others relate to sins: one, the 11th verse of this chapter; the other, Lam. v. 7, both of which we shall hereafter discuss more particularly: and the remaining twenty-three belong literally to *bearing burdens on the shoulder*; and so strictly and exclusively is this signification appropriated to the word, that we find the bearers of burdens employed in the work of the Temple, called (2 Chron. ii. 2, 18; xxxiv. 13,) איש סבל, סבלים; by the LXX, νωτόφοροι; and in one passage, it is even used to express a *yoke* (Isa. x. 27,) LXX, ζυγός: see Calas. and Kircher: see also Buxt. Cocc. and Schindl. they seem decisive on the point. Buxtorf supplies several instances of the application of the word, from the *Jerusalem Targum*; all of which coincide with the sense here contended for. Schindler quotes a remarkable use of the word, in the Syriac translation of Saint Mark, v. 26, it being there applied to the woman who is said to have "*suffered* many things (ϖαθοῦσα ϖολλὰ) of the physicians." For other instances of a similar use of the word in the Syriac, see Schaaf's *Test. Syriac*, 1 Cor. xiii. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 17; also Schaaf's *Lexicon Syriac.* on the word ܣܒܠ. Now, when, in addition to all these authorities, we find the Greek versions uniformly giving to the word, in this place, the sense of *sustaining* or *suffering*, (ὑπέμεινεν being, as we have already seen, the reading of Aq. Sym. and Theodot.; and the LXX expressing both the noun and verb by the one word, ὀδυνᾶται:) the Latin versions also rendering it in like manner; (the old Italic as given by August. strictly following the LXX, pro nobis in doloribus est; the Vulg. Pagn. and Piscat. expressing the word by *portavit;* Montan. and Tremell. by *bajulavit;* Munst. by *sustinuit;* and Castal. by *toleravit:*) and our own English translation supported in the same sense by the most eminent biblical scholars, Vitr. Lowth, Dath. Doederl. and Rosenmüller; it is natural to inquire what arguments have been used by those learned men to whom Mr Dodson refers us for his proof.

But the reader will be surprised to find, that, confidently as Mr Dodson has appealed to them, they furnish no proof at all. Mr Whiston merely translates the passage as Mr Dodson has done, without advancing a single reason in support of it: (see *Boyle's Lectures*, fol. ed. vol. ii. pp. 270. 281.) Dr Taylor (*Key*, &c. § 162.) only says, that סבל will admit the sense of *carrying off*, or *away;* and, in support of this, he instances one solitary passage from Isa. xlvi. 4. which a single glance will prove not to convey this sense.[12] And as to Crellius, he even confesses that he cannot find in the Old Testament a single instance of the use of the word, סבל, in the sense of bearing *away;* and is obliged to confine himself to the repetition of the argument of Socinus, derived from the application of this passage by Saint Matthew to *bodily diseases*, which Christ could be said to bear, only in the sense of bearing away.[13] But, to suppose this clause applied by Saint Matthew to bodily diseases, is a *petitio principii;* the sense, in which it was understood by the Evangelist, being part of the question in dispute. And that it was differently understood and applied by him, will, I trust, presently appear. Thus we find these learned men, to whom Mr Dodson has referred for a complete proof of the point he wishes to establish, fulfilling his engagement in a manner not very satisfactory. Mr Whiston offers no proof; Dr Taylor gives a single, and inapplicable instance; and Crellius begs the question, admitting at the same time the general language of Scripture to be against him. This may furnish a useful hint to unsuspecting readers. — But to proceed.

---

[11] And what is singular, the very authority to which Mr Dodson refers, pronounces decisively against him in the passage before us, rendering the word by *sorrows* in this fourth verse as well as in the verse which precedes it. See Taylor's *Concord.* on כאב, Nos. 23. 25.

[12] It is particularly remarkable also, that Dr Taylor, in his *Concordance*, has not only not adduced a single passage in

That this second clause in the 4th verse relates not to Christ's *removing the sicknesses*, but to his actually *bearing the sorrows* of men, has, I trust, been sufficiently established. Let us now consider the corresponding clause in Saint Matthew's quotation, τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν. This has commonly been referred, it must be confessed, to bodily diseases; but, whether the occasion on which it is introduced, joined to the certainty that the preceding clause is applied in this sense, may not have led to this interpretation of the words, is worthy of inquiry. That the word νόσος is primarily applied to bodily diseases, there can be no question. Dr Kennicott contends (*Diss. Gen.* § 79.) that it is used here to express diseases of the mind. In this he adopts the notion of Grot. on Matt. viii. 17: and certain passages both in the Old and New Testament undoubtedly apply the word in this sense. Thus Psal. ciii. 3. "Who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy *diseases*." Wisd. xvii. 8. "They that promised to drive away terrors and troubles from a *sick* soul." Also, 1 Tim. vi. 4. "He is proud, *doting* (or rather *distracted*, νοσῶν) about questions and strifes of words." Schleusner also explains the word νοσέω, as metaphorically applied to the mind; and quotes in confirmation of this, Ælian, and Julius Pollux. To the same purpose Elsner (*Observ. Sac.* tom. ii. p. 307.) appeals to Plutarch, Lucian, &c. And, if νόσος, as all Lexicons agree, corresponds to the *morbus* of the Latins, there can be no question of its occasional application to the disorders of the mind.

Now, if the word be taken in this sense in this passage of Matthew, it will exactly agree with the *sorrows*, or *sufferings*, of Isaiah. Or if, supposing it to denote bodily disease, it be used by metonymy (as Vitringa, on Isa. liii. 4, explains it) for *pains and afflictions*, the cause being put for the effect: or if, again, with Glassius, (*Phil. Sacr. Dath.* p. 972.) Doederlein, (on Isa. liii. 4.) and other distinguished Biblical critics, it be supposed merely to express the *punishment of sins*, bodily diseases being viewed by the Jews familiarly in that light; or if, waving these interpretations, which some may consider as too strongly figurative, the word be taken in its largest sense, as comprehending *ills* and *afflictions* in general, without regarding what their cause might be, — it will equally correspond with the expression of the prophet.

And, that it is to be taken in this large sense, and by no means to be confined to mere bodily disease, is yet farther confirmed by the emphatical verb βαστάζειν, which is connected with it, and which so adequately conveys the force of the Hebrew, סבל. "In this word," Grotius (on Matt. viii. 17.) remarks, "as in the Hebrew סבל and its corresponding ܣܒܠ[14] which is here used by the Syriac version, is contained the force of burden and suffering." Thus Matt. again, xx. 12, "have *borne* the burden and heat of the day." And Luke, xiv. 27. "Whosoever doth not *bear* his cross." John, xvi. 12. "But he cannot *bear* them now." Acts, xv. 10. "A yoke on the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to *bear*." And in the same sense we find it used by Saint Paul, Gal. vi. 2. "*Bear* ye one another's *burdens;* also v. 10. "He that troubleth you shall *bear* his judgment:" And again, Rom. xv. 1. "We that are strong ought to *bear* the infirmities of the weak." It must be unnecessary to cite more passages. There are, in all, twenty-six in the New Testament, in which the word βαστάζω occurs, exclusive of this of Matt. viii. 17: and in no one is the sense any other, than that of *bearing*, or *lifting as a burden*. (See Steph. *Concord.*) The four passages which are adduced by Taylor, (*Key*, 162.) viz. Mark, xiv. 13; Luke, vii. 14; John, xii. 6, and xx. 15, all of them imply this very idea: for even though the thing spoken of were eventually to be *carried away*, yet this necessarily requires that it should be *carried* or *borne*, as a burden. But what makes this objection the more ex-

---

which the sense of *bearing* otherwise than as a burden is conveyed; but he actually explains the word in this sense: "to *bear*, or *carry a burden*, as a porter." In the passage at present in dispute, indeed, he introduces the sense of bearing away: but then he does this avowedly on the supposition, that this passage is to be explained by the *diseases* spoken of by Saint Matthew.

[13] See Crell. *Resp. ad Gr.* p. 24; also, Socin. *de Jes. Chr.* pars 2. cap. 4. *Opera*, tom. ii. p. 149.

[14] On the force of the Syriac word ܣܒܠ consult Schaaf. *Lexic. Syriac.* So emphatical is this word, that the noun ܣܒܠܐ derived from it, is used to signify *onus*, *pondus*, *sarcina*, &c.

traordinary is, that the carrying *away* is not necessarily implied in any one of them: the carrying (bajulare, *Vulg.* and Tertull. and *Cod. Brix.*) the pitcher of water, which is spoken of in one; and the bearing the dead man's bier, that is referred to in another; conveying simply the idea of *bearing.* The two passages in John also, one relating to Judas bearing the bag, and the other to the taking away the body of Jesus, are by no means conclusive: the interpretation of *carrying away*, or *stealing*, what was put into the bag, though supported by B. Pearce and others, being but conjectural, and standing without any support from the Scripture use of the word: and *lifting* being all that is necessarily meant with respect to the body of Christ, although the consequence of that lifting was the carrying it away, and that our version, attending to the general sense more than to the strict letter, has rendered it, *borne him hence.*

I will only remark, in addition, that Dr Taylor has contrived to exhibit a much more numerous array of texts in support of his sense of the word *βαστάζω*, than those here examined. He has cited no fewer than ten. But this is a sort of *deceptio visus;* there being but the four above referred to in which the term occurs. The word *ἐβάστασε* he had joined with two others, *ἔλαβε* and *ἀνήνεγκε*, and pursued the investigation of them jointly: thus the text in which any of these words was contained became necessary to be cited, and appeared to be applied to all. Whether this be an accurate mode of examining the signification of words, which may differ in meaning or force; or whether it may not tend to make a false impression on the hasty reader, by presenting to his view a greater number of authorities, than really exist, in support of a particular acceptation, it would not be amiss for those who are used to talk largely about candour to consider. This digression, though it somewhat retards the course of the argument, I thought it right to make, as, perhaps, there is nothing more useful than to put young readers on their guard against the arts of controversy. To proceed.

The use of the word *βαστάζω* in the Old Testament, by the LXX, Sym. and Aq. confirms the acceptation here contended for (see Trom. *Concord.* and Biel.[15]) Amongst profane writers, also, we find additional authorities. Albert (*Observ. Phil.* on John, xvi. 12,) supplies a strong instance from Epictetus. Raphelius likewise (on John, xx. 15,) although his mistake respecting the meaning of Matt. viii. 17, has led him to give the force of *asportare* to the word, adduces another equally strong from Polybius. In conformity with this acceptation, also, we find Tremellius's and Schaaf's versions from the Syriac, and Beza's from the Greek, as well as the Vulg. and the Old Latin, render the word by *portat;* the plain and direct meaning of which is to *bear as a burden.* It may be likewise remarked, that Rosenmüller, although embarrassed with the notion that *νόσους* here implies bodily disease, is yet obliged by the force of the verb *βαστάζω*, to apply it in the above signification, notwithstanding it makes little less than nonsense of the passage: "*oneri* sanandi morbos nostros, *humeros supposuit,*" is his explication of the words.

If the remarks which have been made be just, the result of the whole is, that the Prophet and the Evangelist entirely agree. They use the same language, and in the same sense: and the translation which Bishop Lowth has given will, with a slight variation, accurately convey the sense of both. "Our infirmities he hath borne (away;) and our sorrows, he hath carried them:" or, as Dr Kennicott translates both, "Morbos nostros abstulit, et ægritudines nostras portavit." And this last is very nearly the version of the Old Latin, as given by Tertullian (see Sabatier on Isaiah, liii. 4,) "Imbecillitates nostras aufert, et languores nostros portat;" or, as Ambros. "ægritudines nostras portavit;" and it is accurately conveyed by the old version of Coverdale, which Dr Kennicott (*Diss. Gen.* p. 45. note a,) does not scruple in many instances to prefer to our present English translation, "He only *taketh away* our *infirmite*, and *beareth* our *paine.*"[16] Thus are Isaiah and Matthew perfectly reconciled: the first clause in each, relating to *diseases removed;* and the second, to *sufferings endured.* For it should be remarked, in addition to what has been already said, that ἔλαϐε and ἐϐάστασε in Matthew bear to each other the proportion of the verbs נשא and סבל in Isaiah : the former in each of these pairs being generic, ϖολύσημον, and extending to all modes of *taking* or *bearing*, *on*, or *away :* and the latter being specific, and confined to the single mode of *bearing as a burden.* And now, by the same steps by which the Prophet and the Evangelist have been reconciled, we find the original objection derived from Saint Matthew's application of the prophecy completely removed ; since we now see, that the *bearing*, applied by the Evangelist to *bodily disease*, is widely different from that which the Prophet has applied to *sins ;* so that no conclusion can be drawn from the former use of the word, which shall be prejudicial to its commonly received sense in the latter relation.

---

[15] It is to be observed, that it is not only the Concordance itself that is to be consulted, but more particularly, Montfaucon's *Lexic. Græc. ad Hexapla*, which Trommius has placed at the end of his Concordance, and which is to be esteemed as a most valuable collection from the fragments of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Of this Lexicon, as well as of the labours of Trommius, Biel has freely availed himself, in the compilation of his valuable *Lexicon in LXX et alios Interp.* &c. From these works it will be seen, that Aquila has employed the words *βάσταγμα* and *βάστάζω*, for the Hebrew סבל in Exod. i. 11, and for עמס in Zech. xii. 3: and that Symmachus has applied it to the word סבל in Exod. i. 11, and Psal. lxxx. 7. Now these instances from Aquila and Symmachus are singularly important upon the present occasion, because the original word which they have thus rendered, is the word סבל, which, I have already endeavoured to shew, unequivocally implies the *bearing of a burden;* and also because the version of the former is eminently distinguished by its literal agreement with the original Hebrew, (as see particularly Dath. *Opusc. Dissert. in Aquil.* p. 1—15.) The words סבל and *βαστάζω* thus appear exactly to correspond. — See also Stockius's *Lexicon in Nov. Test.* and Pasor's *Greek Lexicon*, edited by Schoettgen.

[16] The late Principal Campbell has, I find, been led by a close examination of the subject to the translation of the evangelist which has been here contended for: "He hath himself *carried off* our *infirmities*, and *borne* our *distresses.*" In his note on the passage, he falls, indeed, into the common mistake of supposing, that Saint Peter and Saint Matthew refer to the same part of the prophecy of Isaiah; remarking, that "we should rather call that the fulfilment of the prophecy, which is mentioned 1 Pet. ii. 24." — Campbell's *Four Gospels*, vol. iii. p. 66, and vol. iv. p. 74.

One point yet, however, demands explanation. It will be said, that, by this exposition, the prophet is no longer supposed to confine himself to the view of our redemption by Christ's sufferings and death ; but to take in also the consideration of his miraculous cures ; and the Evangelist, on the other hand, is represented as not attending merely to the cures performed by Christ, with which alone he was immediately concerned ; but as introducing the mention of his suffering for our sins, with which his subject had no natural connection.

Now, to this I reply, first, with regard to the prophet, that it is not surprising, that so distinguishing a character of the Messiah, as that of his "healing all manner of diseases with a word," and one which this prophet has elsewhere (xxxv. 5,) depicted so strongly, that our Saviour repeats his very words (Batt's *Diss.* 2d edit. p. 109,) and refers to them in proof that he was the Messiah, (Matt. xi. 4, and Beausobre *in loc.*) it is not, I say, surprising, that this character of Christ should be described by the prophet. And that it should be introduced in this place, where the prophet's main object seems to be to unfold the plan of our redemption, and to represent the Messiah as suffering for the sins of men, will not appear in any degree unnatural, when it is considered, that the Jews familiarly connected the ideas of sin and disease ; the latter being considered by them the temporal[17] punishment of the former. So that he, who was described as averting, by what he was to *suffer*, the penal consequences of sin, would naturally be looked to as removing, by what he was to *perform*, its temporal effects : and thus the mention of the one would reasonably connect with that of the other ; the whole of the prophetic representation becoming, as Kennicott happily expresses it, "Descriptio Messiæ benevolentissime et agentis et patientis." (*Diss. Gen.* § 79.)

That the Evangelist, on the other hand, though speaking more immediately of the removal of bodily diseases, should at the same time quote that member of the prophecy which related to the more important part of Christ's office, that of saving men from their sins, will appear equally reasonable, if it be recollected, that the sole object, in referring to the prophet concerning Jesus, was to prove him to be the Messiah ; and that the distinguishing character of the Messiah was, "to give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins," (Luke, i. 77.) So that the Evangelist may be considered as holding this leading character primarily in view ; and, at the same time that he marks to the Jews the fulfilment of one part of the prophecy, by the healing of their bodily distempers, or, as Dr Taylor well expresses it, represents our Lord as acting one part of his saving work described by the prophet, he directs their attention to that other greater object of our Saviour's mission, on which the prophet had principally enlarged, —namely, the procuring forgiveness of their sins by his suffering. And thus, the present fulfilment of the prophecy was, at the same time, a designation of the person, and a pledge of the future more ample completion of the prediction. Grotius, notwithstanding he has fallen into the common error respecting the word חלינו in Isaiah, and the supposition that Saint Peter and Saint Matthew refer to the same part of the prophecy, deserves particularly to be consulted on this passage of Matthew. Cocceius also, in his Lexicon (on the word סבל,) gives this excellent explanation ; "he hath taken on himself (suscepit) our sorrows or sufferings eventually to bear them away, as he has now testified by the carrying away our bodily distempers."

If it should be asked, why, if it were a principal object with the Evangelist to point out the great character of the Messiah as suffering for sins, he did not proceed to cite those other parts of the prophecy, which are still more explicit on that head ; I answer, that, having to address himself to those who were perfectly conversant in the prophecies, he here, as elsewhere, contents himself with referring to a prediction, with the particulars of which he supposes his readers to be familiarly acquainted ; merely directing them to the person of whom it treats, and then leaving it to themselves to carry on the parallel between the prophecy and the farther verification of it in Jesus. On Saint Matthew's peculiar mode of citing the prophecies, see some excellent observations of Dr Townson. *Disc.* iv. Sect. ii. § 5. and Sect. iv. § 3.

---

[17] For abundant proof of this, see Whitby on Matth. viii. 17, and particularly on ix. 2. See also Grot. Beausob. and Rosenm. on Matt. ix. 2. Drusius on the same, *Crit. Sac.* tom. vi. p. 288 ; and Doederl. on Isaiah, liii. 4. Martini also on the same passage observes, "Ipsa vero dicendi formula interpretanda est ex opinione constante tum populorum antiquiorum omnium, tum maximè Orientalium, quâ graviores calamitates quascunque, sive illæ morbis et corporis cruciatibus, sive aliis adversitatibus continerentur, immediate ad Deum, peccatorum vindicem referre, easque tanquam pœnas ab irato numine inflictas, considerare solebant. See Rosenm. on Isaiah, liii. 4.

If, after all that has been said, any doubt should yet remain as to the propriety of thus connecting together, either in the prophet or the evangelist, the healing of diseases and the forgiveness of sins, I would beg of the reader to attend particularly to the circumstance of their being connected together frequently by our Lord himself. Thus, he says to the sick of the palsy, when he healed him, "thy sins be forgiven thee," (Matt. ix. 2.) And, that bodily diseases were not only deemed by the Jews, but were in reality, under the first dispensation, in many instances, the punishment of sin, we may fairly infer from John v. 14, where Jesus said to him whom he had made whole, "Sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee." It should be observed, also, that what in Mark, iv. 12, is expressed, "and their sins should be forgiven them," is given in Matt. xiii. 15, "and I should heal them." See also James, v. 15, and Isaiah, xxxiii. 24, and observe the maledictions against the transgressors of the law in Deut. xxviii. 21. See also, in addition to the authors named in p. 115, Grot. on John, v. 14, Glass. *Phil. Sac. a Dath.* p. 972, and Le Clerc, and particularly Poole's *Syn.* on Matt. ix. 2.

I have dwelt thus long upon this head, because there is no point on which the adversaries, not only of the doctrine of atonement, but of that of the divine inspiration of the evangelists, rely more triumphantly, than on the supposed disagreement between Saint Matthew and the prophet from whom he quotes in the passage before us.

We come now to the second head of objection; namely, that the words in the original, which are rendered by *bearing sins*, do not admit the signification of *suffering for* them, but are, both in this prophecy, and elsewhere throughout the Old Testament, understood in the sense of *taking them away*.

The two words, which are used by the prophet to express *bearing* sin, are, as we have seen, p. 104, סבל in the 11th verse, and נשא in the 12th. Let us then inquire, in what sense these words are used in other parts of the Old Testament. The word נשא, it is true, as we have already seen with respect to the 4th verse, is often applied in the signification of *bearing away;* but being (like the word *bear* in English, which has no less than thirty-eight different acceptations in Johnson's *Dict.*) capable of various meanings, according to the nature of the subject with which it is connected; so we find it, when joined with the word *sin,* constantly used throughout Scripture, either in the sense of *forgiving* it, on the one hand; or of *sustaining,* either directly or in figure, the penal consequences of it, on the other. Of this latter sense, I find not less than thirty-seven instances, exclusive of this chapter of Isaiah; in all of which, "bearing the burden of sins, so as to be rendered liable to suffer on account of them," seems clearly and unequivocally expressed. In most cases, it implies *punishment* endured, or incurred: whilst, in some few, it imports no more than a representation of that punishment; as in the case of the scape-goat, and in that of Ezekiel lying upon his side, and thereby "bearing the iniquity," *i. e.* representing the punishment[18] due to the iniquity, "of the house of Israel." But in no one of all this number can it be said to admit the signification of carrying *away,* unless perhaps in the case of the scape-goat, Lev. xvi. 22, and in that of the priests, Ex. xxviii. 38, and Lev. x. 17, and of these no more can be alleged, than that they may be so interpreted. See on these at large, p. 117—119.

To these instances of the word נשא, connected with חטא, עון, "sins, iniquities," &c. may fairly be added those in which it stands combined with the words חרפה, כלמה, "disgrace, reproach, shame," &c. of which there are eighteen to be found: and in all of them, as before, the word is used in the sense of *enduring, suffering.* The idea, therefore, of a *burden to be sustained,* is evidently contained in all these passages. Of the former sense of the word, when connected with *sins, iniquities, offences,* either expressed or understood, namely, that of *forgiving,* there are twenty-two; in all which cases, the nominative to the verb נשא is the person who was to grant forgiveness. To *forgive,* then, on the part of him who had the power so to do; and to *sustain,* on the part of him who was deemed either actually or figuratively the offender, seem to exhaust the significations of the word נשא, when connected with *sins, transgressions,* and words of that import. *In conformity* with this induction, Schindler (*Lex. Pentag.* in נשא, No. III.) affirms, that this verb, when joined with the word *sin,* always signifies either to *forgive* it; or to *bear* it, *i. e.* to suffer for it: *remittere, condonare;* vel *luere, dare pœnas.*

Now, it has been commonly taken for granted, and Socinus even assumes it as the foundation of his argument, (*De Jes. Chr.* pars 2, cap. 4,) that this signification of *forgiveness,* which evidently is not the radical meaning of the word, has been derived from the more general one of *bearing away, removing.* But this seems to have had no just foundation: *bearing away,* necessarily implying something of a burden to be carried, it seems difficult to reconcile such a phrase with the notion of that Being, to whom this act of forgiveness is attributed, throughout the Old Testament. May not the word have passed to this acceptation, through its primary sense of *bearing;* namely, *suffering,* through patience, *enduring,* or *bearing with?* And it is remarkable that Cocceius, at the same time that he complies with the general idea, of referring the signification of the word in the sense of *forgiving sin* to its acceptation of *tollere, auferre,* admits, that "in this phrase is contained the notion of *bearing; ferendi,* nempe per *patientiam.*" (Lexic. on נשא Number IX.) It is certain that the mercy of God is represented throughout Scripture, as being that of *long suffering,* and of great patience. See Psalm lxxxvi. 15, and particularly Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7, and Numb. xiv. 18, where this very character is joined with the word נשא, as that under which the Deity is represented as forgiving iniquity. And it is deserving of remark, that, in the verse following the passage in Numbers, the forgiveness expressed by the word נשא, is described to be of that nature which implies *patient endurance;* for it is said, "as thou hast forgiven נשאתה, this people, *from Egypt even until now.*" Agreeably to this reasoning, Houbigant translates the word נשא, in both the last passages, *parcere.* Thus, then, upon the whole, the generic signification of the word נשא, when applied to *sins,* seems to be that of *bearing, suffering, enduring:* and then, on the part of the sinner, it implies, *bearing the burden,* or penal consequences of transgression; and on the part of him against whom the offence has been committed, *bearing with,* and patiently enduring it.

---

[18] See Newcome, Munst. Vatabl. and Clarius, on Ezek. iv 4, 5.

We are now enabled to form a judgment of the fairness of Dr Taylor's criticism, (*Key,* No. 162,) on which Mr Dodson, (Isaiah, liii. 4,) and all the writers who oppose the doctrine of Christ's vicarious suffering, so confidently rely. We here see, that the language of Scripture furnishes no authority for translating the word נשא, when connected with *iniquities,* in the sense of *bearing away.* Dr Taylor, indeed, adduces instances of this use of the term; but they are almost all inapplicable to the present case; none of them relating to *iniquities,* except the three which have been already alluded to in p. 113, namely Ex. xxviii. 38; Lev. x. 17; and xvi. 22. If, then, these three be found not to justify his explication, he is left without a single passage, of that great number in which this word is used in reference to iniquities, to support his interpretation.

Now, as to the first of these, in which Aaron is said to "bear the iniquity of the holy things;" besides that the iniquity here spoken of, being a *profanation* of the holy things, scarcely supplies an instance of עון, in the direct sense of iniquity, combined with the verb; there seems no reason whatever to doubt, that נשא is here to be taken in its usual signification of *bearing the blame of, being made answerable for;* as in the passage in Numb. xviii. 1, which exactly corresponds to this, and as Houbigant here translates it, *suscipient* maculas donorum. See Number XXXVII. p. 89; and in addition to the authorities there named, Munst. Vatabl. Clar. Fag. and Grot. on Numb. xviii. 1. It must be remarked, also, that the word ἐξαίρω,[19] used in this passage by the LXX as equivalent to נשא, furnishes no support to the objection; the term applied by the LXX to express the same thing in the parallel passage in Numb. xviii. 1, being λαμϐάνω, which is the term commonly made use of by them to render נשא in those cases, where bearing the burden of sins by suffering for them, is understood. See on this p. 121.

The word נשא, in the 2d passage, (Levit. x. 17,) has been pronounced, upon the authority of the LXX, which renders לשאת here ἵνα ἀφέλητε, to relate to the priests, and consequently to signify, not *bearing,* but, bearing *away.* But, even admitting the word in this place to be connected with the priests, and not with the victim, yet would it not thence necessarily follow, that the word could be used only in the sense of bearing *away;* it having appeared, from what has been just said, that in its strict sense it might be applied with propriety even to the priests; and in this way we find it explained by Jun. and Trem. who thus expound it in this place: "ut a cœtu iniquitatem in vos transferatis et recipiatis expiandam;" and, at the same time, to denote the manner in which this bearing the sins of the congregation was understood, refer to Levit. xvi. 21, 22, in which the priest is described as personating the people, laying his hands on the head of the victim, and whilst he placed the sins of the people thereon, making confession in their name, and as their representative, so that he might be considered as bearing their sins, until he placed them upon the head of the goat. In like manner Patrick, —"the priest here, by eating of the sin-offering, receiving the guilt upon himself, may well be thought to prefigure One, who should be both priest and sacrifice for sin."

---

[19] If the use of the word ἐξαίρω by the Seventy, for the Hebrew נשא, supplied a proof that they understood the original word in the sense of bearing *away,* then must they have understood Levit. ix. 22, in the sense of Aaron's bearing *away* his hand, and Numb. xxiv. 2, in the sense of Balaam's bearing *away* his eyes; for in both of these places have they rendered נשא by ἐξαίρω. But this, it is clear, would make actual nonsense of those passages: the sense being manifestly that of *lifting up* in both. In this sense, indeed, it will be found, upon examination, that the word ἐξαίρω has been applied by the LXX, in every case where it has been substituted for the Hebrew נשא throughout the Bible: the only places where it has been so used being these which follow:—Gen. xxix. 1; Ex. xxviii. 38; Lev. ix. 22; Numb. xxiv. 2; Jer. li. 9; Ezek. i. 19—21; iii. 14; x. 16; xx. 15, 23; Dan. ii. 35; Zech. v. 7.

Houbigant translates, "quâ plebis iniquitatem *subcatis*;" and Stanhope (*Boyle's Lect.* fol. vol. i. p. 779) likewise explains it, by the priests "taking the sin upon themselves." Vatablus, again, who also refers the word נשא to the priests, and yet does not explain it in the sense of *bearing*, that is *sustaining*, interprets it in the absolute signification of *forgiveness*, without hinting that this was to be effected in the sense of bearing *away*; "that you should *forgive*," he says, "that is, declare the forgiveness of," &c. And, indeed, it is remarkable, that the only passages in which the LXX have rendered נשא, when connected with sins, by the verb ἀφαιρέω, are, besides the present one, these two, Exod. xxxiv. 7, and Numb. xiv. 18; in both of which God is represented as "long-suffering and *forgiving* iniquity," &c. and in which, what has been said in p. 114, may perhaps be sufficient to shew that the sense of bearing away is not included. So that, were we to argue from analogy, the word ἀφέλητε in this place, referred by the LXX to the priests, should be taken in the sense of forgiveness simply: in which sense[20] it is also used by the LXX in Exod. xxxiv. 9, where the original is סלח, *condono*. And thus, no argument arises in favour of the signification of bearing *away*.

But, moreover, the sense of the word ἀφαιρέω, in the application of it by the LXX, is not to be concluded from its ordinary derivation. We find it, all through Levit. and Numb. especially in the 18th chapter of the latter, used to express the *offering* heave-offerings and wave-offerings to the Lord: and it seems remarkable, that, in that chapter, special directions are given, that all such parts of the offerings, as are to be waved and presented to the Lord, should be eaten by the priests; and with respect to these the word ἀφαιρέω is constantly used, and they are declared to be most holy, (see Munst. Fag. Vatab. Clar. in Numb. xviii. 8.) These things certainly bear a strong resemblance to the particulars of the passage in Leviticus. But this I do not offer, as fixing the meaning of the LXX in this place. The word ἁμαρτίαν following the verb in the sense of *iniquity*, עון, seems inconsistent with this application of the word ἀφαιρέω here. It serves, however, to shew, that the use of the word ἀφέλητε by the LXX, is not decisive of their rendering the original in the sense of *bearing away*. And, indeed, when the word 'ΑΠΟ-φέρω has been used by them as a translation of נשא, in a sense manifestly different from that of bearing *away*, (see p. 121,) the mere derivation of the word ἀφαιρέω should not be deemed demonstrative of their applying it in that sense.

But, besides, there seems no sufficient reason for rendering the sentence so as to apply the expression to the *priests*, and not to the *sin-offering*. Commentators, indeed, seem generally to have assumed this point; and Crellius (tom. i. p. 20.) in his answer to Grotius, builds on it with perfect confidence. The system, likewise, of the author of the *Scrip. Acc. of Sac.* is in a great measure founded upon it. (pp. 123. 145.) But excepting only the authority of the LXX, there appears no ground whatever for this interpretation; and, accordingly, not only does Grotius (*De Satisfact. Chr.* cap. i. § 10.) positively affirm that this passage affords an instance of "the *victim* being said to bear the iniquity of the offerer," but even Sykes himself, at the same time that he notices the version of the LXX, seems to admit the same. (*Ess. on Sac.* p. 144.) And I will venture to say, that whoever attends carefully to the original will see good reason to concur in this interpretation. The passage exactly corresponds in structure with that in Lev. xvii. 11: and the comparison may throw light upon the subject. Here, the priests are rebuked for not having eaten the sin-offering, and the reason is assigned; "for it is most holy, and God hath given it to you, to bear (לשאת, for the bearing,) the iniquity of the congregation," &c. There the Jews are ordered not to eat blood, and the reason is assigned; "for the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make atonement (לכפר, for the making atonement) for your souls," &c. Now, because the word *you* happens to lie nearest to the verb לכפר in this sentence, are we to infer, that the *persons spoken to*, were to make the atonement, and not the *blood*, which, though it happens to be placed farthest from the verb, is yet the subject evidently carried through the whole sentence, and is immediately after pronounced to be that which made the atonement? Yet this is the reasoning applied to the former passage, which is precisely parallel.

Indeed, I cannot help thinking that the whole of this passage in Lev. x. 17. has been hitherto misunderstood; and although, independent of the explanation which I am going to offer, the sense of the word *bear* which I contend for seems already sufficiently established, yet, since this is an interpretation which appears generally to have been overlooked, I must beg to propose it here. Moses rebukes the sons of Aaron, because they had not eaten the sin-offering, as he had before commanded should be done, in the 6th chapter. Now, in that chapter he had directed that the offering for the *priests* should not be eaten, but should be entirely consumed with fire; (ver. 23.) but that the sin-offering for the

---

[20] It should be observed also, that in Psal. xxxii. 6, where נשא is undoubtedly used in the sense of *forgiveness*, and is accordingly rendered by the LXX ἀφίημι, the word used by Symmachus is ἀφαιρέω.

people should be eaten by the priests (ver. 26.) In the 9th chapter we find Aaron, under the direction of Moses, presenting a sin-offering for himself, and another for the people; but, instead of obeying Moses's commands respecting the sin-offering *for the people* by eating it, he had burned it, as well as the sin-offering for himself. This is the occasion of Moses's displeasure, (x. 16.) and he reminds the sons of Aaron (ver. 17.) that the goat being the sin-offering *for the people*, being appointed to "bear the iniquity of the *congregation*," (not that of the priests,) it should therefore have been eaten. The force of the passage then is not, "God hath given it *you* to (eat, that by so doing ye might) bear (away) the iniquity of the congregation, &c. but, God hath given you *it* (to eat, it being the offering appointed to bear, or, as is the strict translation,) for the bearing (in whatever sense the sacrifice was usually conceived to bear) the iniquity of the *congregation*." This seems the most obvious and intelligible construction of this passage; and, if this be admitted, it is evident that this text furnishes no support to the opinions of those who object to the sense of the word *bear* contended for in this Number.

As little support will the remaining text supply, which relates to the scape-goat, (Lev. xvi. 22. That the scape-goat was represented as going into the wilderness, whilst he symbolically *bore* the sins of the people, which had been laid upon him, is certain; and that he consequently bore them *away*, is equally certain; but, that it thence follows, that the word used to express his bearing those sins must of itself signify to bear *away*, seems an unwarrantable conclusion. Their being borne *away*, was a necessary consequence of the goat's *going away*, whilst the symbolical burden lay upon his head; and therefore proves nothing as to the meaning of the word here rendered to *bear*. Any word, which implied the sustaining a burden in any way, might have here been equally applied, unless it at the same time conveyed the notion of standing still under the burden, of which language (so far as I know) does not supply an instance. So that, in fact, the argument here seems to amount to this: that the word *bear*, leads the mind to bearing away, when the word *away* is connected with it:—a position not necessary to combat.

It deserves also to be remarked, that the LXX have not here used any of those terms, which might be supposed to countenance the sense of bearing away. Ἀναφέρω, ἀποφέρω, ἀφαιρέω, ἐξαίρω, (which Dr Taylor, and those who adopt his notions, are so desirous of bringing forward on other occasions, as proving the Septuagint interpretation of נשא in that sense,) are all rejected by the LXX in this case; in which, if bearing *away* was intended, these, or some word which might mark that meaning, would most naturally have been adopted; and λαμβάνω, by which נשא is constantly rendered by the LXX in those cases where the actual sustaining of sins and their consequences is concerned, is the term employed.

We have now seen what is the full amount of Dr Taylor's objections against our account of the Scripture acceptation of the word נשא, when applied to sins: the three instances, whose value we have just considered, being all that he is able to oppose to a collection of thirty-four passages, which unequivocally apply the word נשא to the *sustaining* of sin, or its consequences; together with eighteen more, which, without exception, combine the word in the same sense with the terms *shame*, *reproach*, &c. And it is curious to observe, that it is from a signification of the word established upon such grounds and in opposition to such evidence, that he has deduced the force of the expression when applied to the *forgiveness* of iniquities; contending that it derives this signification from its more general meaning of bearing *away*, previously ascertained in the way we have described.

Crellius, who is appealed to by Mr Dodson on the signification of this word נשא, as he was before on that of סבל, (see p. 109,) adds but little strength to the cause. He mentions, indeed, an admission by Grotius, and an interpretation by Vatablus; but he refers us for the complete proof to Socinus, as Mr Dodson had referred us to him. Socinus is to prove the point by examples, "prolatis exemplis." (Crell. *Resp. ad Grot.* p. 24.) Now, the examples adduced by Socinus, to prove that the word נשא, applied to sins, may properly be translated in the sense of bearing away, are the two which have been already noticed in p. 114, viz. Exod. xxxiv. 7, and Numb. xiv. 18. And these, he says, clearly prove it, because here the word is applied in the sense of *forgiving*, and that was done by bearing *away* or *removing* sins, or their punishment. See Socin. *Opera De Jes. Chr.* pars 2. cap. 4. pp. 148, 149. But, surely, since the dictum of this father of Socinianism was at last to decide the point, it had been sufficient had he at once affirmed it, without the circuitous form of an example.

Sykes, indeed, has discovered, as he thinks, one instance, which clearly establishes the acceptation of the word in the sense of bearing *away* iniquity: it is that of Exod. x. 17. And I confess, were I confined to a single passage for the proof of the opposite, I think it is the one I should select, as marking, most decidedly, that this word has not acquired the sense of *forgiving*, through the signification of *bearing away*. Pharaoh says unto Moses, "*forgive* (שא) I pray thee my sin only this once, and entreat the Lord that he may *take away* (יסר) from me this death." Now, if the word נשא were rendered, with Dr Sykes, *take away*, it must then be, *take away the punishment* of my sin; taking away the sin itself being unintelligible, and this being the very sense in which the word is said to acquire the force of forgiveness. See Socin. *Opera*, tom. 2. p. 149. But, surely, to desire Moses to take away his punishment, and, after that, to entreat the Lord that he would take away the same punishment, seem not perfectly consistent. Whereas, if we suppose the word *forgiveness* to convey the force of *enduring, bearing with*, all is perfectly natural: and Moses, having thus forgiven the *sin* of Pharaoh, might reasonably be called on to entreat, that the Lord would remit the *punishment.* Besides, it is observable, that, where the punishment is spoken of, there the word used is not נשא, but הסיר which unequivocally signifies, *to take away.*

What then is the result of this unavoidably prolix inquiry? That the word נשא, when connected with the word *sins*, or *iniquities*, is throughout the entire of the Bible to be understood in one of these two significations: *bearing*, i. e. sustaining, on the one hand; and *forgiving*, on the other: and, that in neither of these applications does there seem any reason for interpreting it in the sense of bearing *away:* nor has any one unequivocal instance of its use, in that sense, ever been adduced.

So far as to the word נשא. The meaning of סבל is, if possible, yet more evident. Being used, as we have already seen, p. 109. in every passage, where it is not connected with the word *sins*, or *sorrows*, in the literal sense of *bearing a burden*, we can have but little difficulty to discover its signification where it is so connected. In its reference to sorrows, it has also been specially examined, and the result, as we have seen, has confirmed its general application. Its relation to *sins* is exemplified but in two passages, one of which occurs in the 11th verse of the chapter of Isaiah under consideration, and the other is to be found in Lament. v. 7. Now, it happens that this last passage is such, that the meaning of the word cannot be misunderstood. "Our fathers have sinned, and are not; and we have borne (סבלנו) their iniquities;" or, as Dr Blayney renders it, we have "undergone the punishment of" their iniquities. The force of the word סבל, then, will not admit of question: and if any additional strength were wanting to the argument concerning the verb נשא, this word סבל standing connected with *iniquity* in the 11th verse, exactly as נשא is with *sin* in the 12th, would abundantly supply it. That נשא, indeed, in all cases where the sense of *forgiveness* is not admissible, has the force of סבל when used in relation to *sins*, will readily appear on examination. Their correspondence is particularly remarkable in the parallel application of the two words in the passage of Lamentations just cited, and in those of Numb. xiv. 33. and Ezek. xviii. 19, 20.; in which נשא is used to express the sons' *bearing* the wickedness of their fathers, in precisely the same sense in which סבל is applied in the former.

These two words then, נשא and סבל, being clearly used in the common sense of *bearing sins*, in the 11th and 12th verses of this chapter of Isaiah, it remains yet to ascertain what is the Scripture notion conveyed by that phrase. Now, this is evidently, in all cases, the suffering, or being liable to suffer, some infliction on account of sin, which, in the case of the offender himself, would properly be called punishment. This I take to be the universal meaning of the phrase. The familiar use of the words עון, חטאה *iniquity, sin*, for the *punishment*[21] *of iniquity*, or, as I would prefer to call it, the *suffering due to iniquity*, fully justifies this explication of the phrase: and so obtrusive is its force, that we find this meaning conceded to the expression, even by Sykes, (*Essay on Sac.* p. 146.) Crellius, (*Resp. ad Grot.* p. 20.) and Socinus himself, (*De Jes. Chr.* pars ii. cap. 4.)

But, although the phrase of *bearing sin* is admitted by all to mean, *bearing the punishment or consequences of sin*, in the case where a man's own sin is spoken of, yet it is denied that it admits that signification where the sin of another is concerned: see *Scrip. Acc. of Sacr.* p. 142. Now, in answer to this it is sufficient to refer to the use of the expression in Lament. v. 7. compared with Jer. xxxi. 29, 30,) and to the application of it also in Ezek. xviii. 19, 20. and in Numb. xiv. 33. In all of these, the sons are spoken of, as *bearing the sins* of their fathers; and in none can it be pretended that they were to bear them in the sense of bearing them *away*, or in any other sense than in that of *suffering for* them: and the original term employed to express this is, סבל, in the passage in Lamentations, and נשא in all the rest. Dr Blayney translates the passage in Lamentations,—"Our fathers have sinned, but they are no more, and *we have undergone the punishment of their iniquities.*" Dathe renders the expression, both here, and in Ezekiel, by *luere* peccata; and at the same time affirms, (on Jer. xxxi. 29.) that the meaning of the proverb adduced both in Jeremiah and Ezekiel is, "that God punishes the sins of the fathers in the children." The proverb, to which he alludes, is that of "the fathers having eaten a sour grape, and the children's teeth being set on edge." The time is approaching, Jeremiah says, in which this shall not be any longer, "but every man shall *die for his own iniquity.*" And this time, he subjoins, is to be under the new covenant, which was to be made with the Jewish people, and which was to differ from that which preceded, in that God was not, as hitherto, to visit the sins of the fathers upon the children, but to visit each individual for his own transgressions.

---

[21] See 2 Kings, vii. 9, and Zech. xiv. 19, and besides all the ancient commentators, consult Bishop Lowth on Isaiah, xl. 2, Dr Blayney on Jer. li. 6, and Primate Newcome on Hos. x. 13—the last of whom subjoins the remark, that "this particular metonymy, of the cause for the effect, was natural among the Jews, whose law abounded with temporal sanctions, which God often inflicted."

The same subject is more largely and explicitly treated by Ezekiel. The proverb used by Jeremiah is repeated by this prophet; and, as Primate Newcome observes, is well rendered by the Chaldee, — "The fathers have sinned, and the sons are smitten." This, he says, refers to the second commandment; and, on the peculiar principles of the Jewish dispensation, he admits the reasonableness of it as a judicial infliction. Dr Blayney, indeed, thinks otherwise; although he has expressly translated the passage in Lamentations, "We have undergone the *punishment* of their iniquities." This seems not consistent. Yet he peremptorily rejects the notion of this as a judicial infliction. Had Dr Blayney, however, considered, that the penalties thus inflicted were such as belonged to the old covenant, namely, temporal, he would have seen no difficulty in this dispensation, as affecting the equity of God's proceedings: nor would he have been reduced to the inconsistency of calling that a *punishment* in one place, which he contends cannot be a judicial infliction in another.

Let us follow the prophet a little farther: — he declares, as Jeremiah had done, that this shall no longer be. The judicial dispensation of the new covenant shall be of a different nature. In future, "the soul that sinneth, *it* shall die — if a man be just he shall live; but if he hath done abominations, *he* shall surely die; his blood shall be upon *him* (upon his own head) — and yet ye say, why? *doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father?*" The prophet replies; True, but this shall no longer be: "when the son hath done judgment and justice he shall surely live. The soul that sinneth *it* shall die; the son shall not bear (נשא) the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear (נשא) the iniquity of the son." The passage from Numbers, in which the sons are said to "bear" (נשא) the abominations of their fathers, exactly accords[22] with those which we have now considered: and it appears incontestably from the whole, that *to bear the sins of others*,[23] is an expression familiarly used, to denote the *suffering evils, inflicted on account of those sins.*

I will not contend that this should be called suffering the *punishment* of those sins, because the idea of punishment cannot be abstracted from that of *guilt:* and in this respect I differ from many respectable authorities, and even from Dr Blayney, who, as we have seen, uses the word *punishment* in his translation. But it is evident that it is, notwithstanding, a judicial infliction; and it may perhaps be figuratively denominated *punishment,* if thereby be implied a reference to the actual transgression, and if that suffering which was due to the offender himself be understood; and which, *if* inflicted on him, would then take the name of punishment. In no other sense can the suffering inflicted on one, on account of the transgressions of another, be called a punishment; and, in this light, the bearing the punishment of another's sins, is to be understood as bearing that which, in relation to the sins, and to the sinner, admits the name of punishment, but with respect to the individual on whom it is actually inflicted, abstractedly considered, can be viewed but in the light of suffering. Thus the expression may fairly be explained. It is, however, upon the whole, to be wished, that the word *punishment* had not been used: the meaning is substantially the same without it; and the adoption of it has furnished the principal ground of cavil to the adversaries of the doctrine of atonement, who affect to consider the word as applied in its strict signification, and, consequently, as implying the transfer of actual guilt. I could therefore wish that such distinguished scholars, as Bishop Lowth, Primate Newcome, and Dr Blayney, had not sanctioned the expression.

That the term *punishment*, indeed, has frequently been used, where infliction only, without any reference to guilt in the individual sufferer, was intended, must be allowed. Cicero affords us a memorable instance of this; "Silent leges inter arma; nec se expectari jubent, cum ei qui expectare velit, ante *injusta pœna* luenda sit, quam justa repetenda." The application of the word is yet more justifiable, where the sufferings endured have a relation to the guilt of another, on whom had they been inflicted they would have received the name of punishment in its strictest sense. They are, to use an expression of Crellius, the *materia pœnæ* with respect to the offender; and when borne by another in his stead, that other may in a qualified sense be said to bear the punishment of the offender, as bearing that burden of suffering, which was due to him as the punishment of his offence. And thus in all cases, except where *forgiveness* is intended, the expression נשא עון, or סבל עון, is to be understood : namely, as *sustaining*, or *bearing the burden of that* materia pœnæ, *which was due to the offences*, either of the individual who suffered, or of him on whose account, and in whose place, he suffered. In this sense we may justify the use of the expression bearing *punishment*, in cases of a vicarious nature ; but, to avoid all cavil, and misrepresentation of the phrase, it were better, perhaps, to adopt the phrase of suffering for *sins*.

---

[22] Hammond on 1 Pet. ii. 24, supported by the Chaldee and Fagius, renders the passage here, *bear the punishment of your sins.* See also Ainsworth on Numb. xiv. 33.

[23] The observations of Martini on this subject deserve to be quoted. "Quicunque nimirum malis atque incommodis tolerandis aliorum miseriam avertit, eorumque salutem promovet, quâcunque demum ratione id fiat, is pœnas peccatorum eorum luere, tanquam piaculum pro iis apud Deum intercedere dicitur, ut hominibus priscis fere omnibus, ita imprimis Hebræis. Eadem fere ratio est formulæ Arabibus frequentissimæ, *redemptio tua sit anima mea*, scil. apud Deum, h. e. acerba quævis, quin ipsius adeo mortis discrimen subire non recusarem, modo te juvare, liberationem a periculis, salutem atque incolumitatem tibi præstare possem. Ad explorationem vero ejusmodi formularum si pervenire velis, redeundem omnino est ad opinionem, ut veterum populorum omnium, ita imprimis Hebræorum, ex quâ calamitates quascunque, præsertim atrociores, tanquam pœnas peccatorum ab ipsis diis præsentibus inflictas considerare solebant, easque non aliâ rationi averti posse putabant, quam si victima innocens loco hominis ejusmodi pœnas subeundo, numinis infesti iram sedaret."—See Rosenm. on Isaiah, liii. 6.

This view of the subject completely removes all those objections derived from a rigorous acceptation of the nature of punishment, which have been urged by Socinus, and Crellius, and repeated by every dissenter from the received doctrine of atonement since their day. And it is curious to observe, that Dr Benson, though contending for the notion of Christ's bearing our sins in the sense of bearing them away, and supporting this on the ground of Dr Taylor's interpretation of נשא, סבל, and the corresponding Greek words, in that sense, is yet obliged to admit the justness of the explication here proposed. " *Sin*," he says, " is frequently, in Scripture, put for *sufferings*, or *afflictions*. *Bearing iniquity*, or *sin*, is likewise *bearing punishment*, or *enduring affliction :* and when that punishment, or affliction, was death ; then *bearing iniquity*, or *sin*, and being *put to death*, were phrases of like import." And he admits, in consequence of this reasoning, that Christ's *bearing our sins*, or, as he thinks right to call it, " bearing them *away*, was by his suffering death ; *which, to us, is the penalty of sin*." (Benson on 1 Pet. ii. 24.) So that we seem to have the authority of Dr Benson for saying, that Christ *bore our sins*, by *suffering the penalty due to them*.

It has now, I trust, sufficiently appeared, that the expressions used in this chapter of Isaiah to denote *bearing sins*, are elsewhere in Scripture employed to signify, not *bearing* them *away*, in the indefinite sense of *removing them*, but *sustaining them as a burden*, by suffering their penal consequences ; and this, not only where the individual was *punished* for his own sins, but where he *suffered* for the sins of others. We may now, therefore, proceed to inquire into the true meaning of the phrase, in the prophecy before us : and, indeed, so manifest is its application in this place, that, were it even ambiguous in other parts of Scripture, this alone might suffice to determine its import : so that, but for the extraordinary efforts that have been employed to perplex and pervert the obvious meaning of the words, it could not have been necessary to look beyond the passage itself, to ascertain their genuine signification to be that which has just been stated. In the description here given by the prophet we are furnished with a clear and accurate definition of words, and a full explanation of the nature of the thing. We are told, that God " made the iniquities of us all to fall upon him," who is said to have " borne the iniquities of many ;" thus is the *bearing of our iniquities* explained to be, the *bearing them laid on as a burden ;* and though a reference is undoubtedly intended to the laying the iniquities of the Jewish people on the head of the scape-goat, which was done (as is urged by Socinus, Crellius, Taylor, and other writers who adopt their notions,) that they might be borne, or carried, *away ;* yet this does not prevent them from being borne *as a burden*. The great object in bearing our sins, was certainly to bear them away ; but the manner in which they were borne, so as to be ultimately borne away by Him who died for us, was by his enduring the afflictions and sufferings which were due to them ; by his being numbered with the transgressors ; treated as if he had been the actual transgressor ; and made answerable for us ; and, consequently, wounded for our transgressions, and smitten for our iniquities, in such manner, that our peace was effected by his chastisement, and we healed by his bruises ; he having *borne* our *iniquities*, having suffered that which was the penalty due to them on our part, and having offered himself a sacrifice for sin on our account.

Now, it deserves particularly to be remarked, that these strong and decided expressions, which are clearly explanatory of the manner in which our sins are to be *borne*, and borne *away*, are but little attended to by the Socinian expositors, whilst they endeavour, by a detached examination of the words denoting the *bearing of sins*, and by directing our attention to the ceremony of the scape-goat, to exclude from the view those accompanying circumstances, which so plainly mark a vicarious suffering, and a strict propitiatory atonement. In contending, however, for the reference to the scape-goat in the expression *bearing sins*,[24] as it is here used, these writers furnish us with an additional argument in proof of the scape-goat having been a *sin-offering* (see pp. 97, 104.) ; he, who was to *bear our sins*, and to procure our pardon, being here described expressly as a " sacrifice for sin," אשם. Some arguments, indeed, are offered by Socinus, (*Opera*, tom. ii. pp. 150, 151. 153.) and Crellius, (*Resp. ad Gr.* pp. 23—30.) to weaken the force of the expressive passages of the prophet's description, above referred to. But, after what has been said, it is unnecessary to add to the length of this discussion, by a refutation, which must instantly present itself, on the principles already laid down.

---

[24] See Socin. *Opera*, tom. ii. p. 149. Crell. *Resp. ad Gr.* p. 21, and Taylor's *Key*, § 162.

To bring, then, this tedious investigation to a conclusion, it appears, 1. That neither the expressions used by Isaiah in the 4th verse, nor the application made of them by Saint Matthew, are in any degree inconsistent with the acceptation of the phrase, *bearing sins*, here employed by the prophet, in the sense of *sustaining* or *undergoing the burden of them, by suffering for them:* 2. That the use of the expression in other parts of the Old Testament, so far from opposing, justifies and confirms this acceptation: and, 3. That the minute description of the sufferings of Christ, their cause, and their effects, which here accompanies this phrase, not only establishes this interpretation, but fully unfolds the whole nature of the Christian atonement, by shewing that Christ has suffered, in our place, what was due to our transgressions; and that by, and in virtue of, his sufferings, our reconciliation with God has been effected.

I have gone thus extensively into the examination of this point, both because it has of late been the practice of those writers who oppose the doctrine of atonement to assume familiarly, and *pro concesso*, that the expression *bearing sins*, signified in all cases, where personal punishment was not involved, nothing more than bearing them *away*, or *removing* them; and because this chapter of Isaiah contains the whole scheme and substance of the Christian atonement. Indeed, so ample and comprehensive is the description here given, that the writers of the New Testament seem to have had it perpetually in view, insomuch that there is scarcely a passage either in the Gospels, or Epistles, relating to the sacrificial nature, and atoning virtue of the death of Christ, that may not obviously be traced to this exemplar: so that in fortifying this part of Scripture, we establish the foundation of the entire system. It will, consequently, be the less necessary to inquire minutely into those texts in the New Testament which relate to the same subject. We cannot but recognize the features of the prophetic detail, and, consequently, apply the evidence of the prophet's explanation, when we are told, in the words of our Lord, that "the Son of man came to *give his life a ransom for many*," (Matt. xx. 28;) that, as Saint Paul expresses it, he "*gave himself a ransom for all*," (1 Tim. ii. 6;) that he "was *offered to bear the sins of many*," (Heb. ix. 28;) that God "made *him* to be *sin for us, who knew no sin*," (2 Cor. v. 21;) that "Christ *redeemed* us from the curse of the law, *being made a curse for us*," (Gal. iii. 13;) that he *suffered for sins, the just for the unjust*, (1 Pet. iii. 18;) that he "*died for the ungodly*," (Rom. v. 6;) that he "*gave himself for us*," (Tit. ii. 14;) that he *died for our sins*," (1 Cor. xv. 3;) and "was *delivered for our offences*," (Rom. iv. 25;) that he "*gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God*," (Eph. v. 2;) that "we are *reconciled to God by the death* of his Son," (Rom. v. 10;) that his "blood was shed *for many, for the remission of sins*," (Matt. xxvi. 28.)—These, and many others, directly refer us to the prophet; and seem but partial reflections of what he had already so fully placed before our view.

One passage, however, there is, which deserves a more particular attention; because, being an acknowledged translation of the most important part of the prophetic description, it has, jointly with the prophecy, experienced the severity of Socinian criticism. It is that passage in 1 Pet. ii. 24, where it is said of Christ, that he "his own self *bare our sins*, in his own body, on the tree." This has been referred to the 4th verse of the liiid chap. of Isaiah; but, as we have already seen, (p. 107.) on grounds totally erroneous. With the same view, namely, that of weakening the force of the prophecy, the use of the word ἀνήνεγκε by the apostle, to express the *bearing sins*, of the prophet, has been largely insisted on. The word ἀναφέρω, it is contended, is to be understood in the sense of bearing[25] *away:* and Dr Benson, (on 1 Pet. ii. 24,) positively asserts, that the word ἀναφέρω is never used by the LXX, in any of those places in the Old Testament, where *bearing iniquity* is taken in the sense of *bearing punishment*, or *enduring affliction.* Now, as Saint Peter's words may fairly be considered as a translation of the words of the prophet, or, rather, as an adoption of the language of the LXX, (see p. 107.) it becomes necessary to examine the force of the expressions here used, as being a strong authority respecting the true meaning of the original passage in the prophet. And in this examination we shall find abundant confirmation of the conclusion we have already arrived at.

The word ἀναφέρω, which strictly signifies to bear, or carry, up; and is, therefore, commonly applied in the sense of *offering up* a victim, as *carrying it up* to the altar; and may with equal propriety be applied to Christ bearing up with him "in his own body, τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἐπὶ ξύλον, our sins to the cross," (see Schleusn. *Lex.* and Hamm. *in locum*)—admits, of course, the signification of *bearing as a burden;* and, joined with the word *sins*, as it is here, it corresponds to the Hebrew נשא, or סבל, in the sense of *bearing their punishment*, or *sustaining the burden of suffering* which they impose. In this very sense the seventy have used it, in direct opposition to Dr Benson's assertion: for, in Numb. xiv. 33, where the sons are said to *bear the whoredoms*, or idolatrous sins, of their fathers, the word used by the LXX to express the Hebrew נשא, is ἀναφέρω: now the Chaldee, in this place, employs the word קבל, which is universally allowed to signify *suscipere*, to *undergo*, or *sustain*, (see Buxt. *Lex.*) and translates the whole passage thus, "They shall bear your sins, and I will visit the iniquities of the fathers in the children." Munster, Vatablus, Fagius, and Clarius, pronounce the expression to be a Hebraism, for suffering the punishment of the fathers' sins. Houbigant expressly translates, pœnas luent. That this passage, also, is precisely of the same import with those in Lament. v. 7, and Ezek. xviii. 19, 20,) where *suffering for sins* is expressly marked out, has been already noticed (pp. 117, 118.) Now, in these passages manifestly denoting the very same thing, *bearing sins*, in the same way and on the same account, the version of the LXX is ὑπέσχε in the former; and λαμβάνω in the latter. The force of ὑπέσχε requires no confirmation: if it did, its application in Psalm lxxxix. 50, the only remaining place where it is used by the LXX, would supply it. And λαμβάνω is the expression commonly applied by the LXX, throughout Leviticus, to express the *bearing of sin*, in those cases in which the offender was to suffer the actual punishment of his transgressions. And in the very next verse, we find the word ἀναφέρω applied to denote the bearing these very sins in the persons of the offenders themselves, which, they had been told in the preceding verse, their sons should likewise bear, ἀνοίσουσι. So that these expressions, ἀναφέρω, and λαμβάνω, being employed by the LXX in passages precisely parallel, furnish a complete contradiction to Dr Benson's assertion.

---

[25] See Dodson on Isaiah, liii. 11, also Socin. *De Jes. Chr.* pars 2, cap. vi. and Crell. *Resp. ad Gr.* p. 21.

Indeed the LXX seem to have used the compounds of φέρω, without much attention to the force of the adjoined preposition. This is evident in their use of the word ἀποφέρω, for the Hebrew נשא, in Lev. xx. 19, where the sin was not to be borne *away*, as the word would strictly imply, but to be *borne* by suffering the punishment of death: and likewise, in Ezek xxxii. 30, where *bearing* shame, is applied by the prophet in the same sense. And in this passage, whilst the Vatic. reads ἀποφέρω, the Alex. reads λαμβάνω: thus using the two words indifferently; although λαμβάνω is employed by the LXX, almost universally, in cases implying the actual *sustaining* of guilt and suffering. Now, even if the word ΑΠΟφέρω[26] has been used by the LXX for נשא, in the simple sense of φέρω, and in no other, throughout the Bible; upon what ground is it to be argued, that ʼΑΝΑφέρω cannot be used by them in the same sense; and particularly, when it is employed by them in the translation of the same Hebrew word, and similarly connected with the same subject, *sins?* But, to decide the acceptation of the word by the LXX, it will be sufficient to observe, that, of one hundred and thirty-three passages of the Old Testament, in which, exclusive of those of Isaiah at present under consideration, it is used as a translation of the Hebrew, it never once occurs in the sense of bearing *away*, (see Trom. *Concord.*) and that in those places in which it occurs in the relation of *bearing sins*, it is given as equivalent to the words נשא, and סבל; being employed to render the former in Num. xiv. 33, and Isai. liii. 12; and the latter, Isai. liii. 11. And these three are the only passages in which the word is found so related.

Now, in addition to what has been already said, on the words translated *bearing sins*, in these passages, and especially on the word סבל, let it be remarked, that the word ὑπένεγκε, is used by Symm. for the ἀνοίσει of the LXX, in the last-mentioned text: and that the very word, סבל, which in the 11th verse is translated, ἀναφέρω, by the LXX, is, by the same, rendered in the 4th verse, in the sense of *sustaining;* the term employed by them being ὀδυνᾶται, *enduring grief*, or *affliction;* as if they had said ὀδύνας, or πόνους ʼΥΠΕΜΕΙΝΕΝ, which is the expression used by Aq. Symm. and Theod. in this place. Now, as Saint Peter, in his description of Christ's bearing our sins, not only refers to Isaiah, but evidently quotes his very words, and quotes them in the language of the LXX, we can have no question of his stating them in the same sense in which they manifestly used them; and that when he says, that Christ "bore[27] our sins, in his own body, on (or to) the cross," he means to mark, that Christ actually bore the burden of our sins, and suffered for them all that he endured in his last agonies. That there may also have been implied a reference, in the word ἀναφέρω, to its sacrificial import so familiar both with the LXX and the New Testament, I see no reason to deny. This by no means interferes with what has been now urged, but rather confirms it, and explains more fully the manner in which our sins were borne by our Lord, namely, as by a sacrifice. So that the entire force of the passage may be, as Whitby has stated it; "he bare our sins in his own body, offered (as) upon an altar for us;" and by this interpretation we find a perfect correspondence with the only remaining passage in the New Testament, in which the phrase *ἁμαρτίας ἀναφέρειν* is found; namely, Heb. ix. 28, where it is said, that "Christ was once *offered*, to bear the sins of many."

---

[26] Biel, on the word ἀποφέρω, remarks, that the Doric ἄποισε is expounded by Phavorinus κομίση, "reportabis:" thus, it appears, that the force of the preposition is, in some cases, entirely lost in the compound: and, accordingly, the word sometimes signifies *ad*duco.

[27] The Syriac rendering of the passage is remarkable. ܘܣܒܠ ܚܛܗܝܢ ܟܠܗܝܢ : ܘܐܣܩ ܐܢܝܢ ܒܦܓܪܗ ܠܙܩܝܦܐ. "Et *portavit* peccata nostra omnia, et sustulit illa in corpore suo ad crucem." Here the word ܣܒܠ, *portabat quasi pondus*, is unequivocal and decisive.—N.B. Schaaf has rendered the Syriac *cum* corpore suo; whilst it more naturally admits the rendering, *in* corpore suo, agreeably to the common translation.

The observations contained in this number will enable us to form a just estimate of Dr Priestley's position,—that neither in the Old Testament, nor in those parts of the New where it might most naturally be expected, namely, in the discourses of our Lord and his apostles, as recorded in the Gospels and Acts, do we find any trace of the doctrine of atonement. On this Dr Priestley observes, with no little confidence, in the *Theol. Rep.* vol. i. pp. 327—353; and again in his *Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. pp. 158—164. Surely, in answer to such an assertion, nothing more can be necessary than to recite the prophecy of Isaiah which has just been examined, and in which it is manifest that the whole scheme of the doctrine of atonement is minutely set forth; so manifest, indeed, that, notwithstanding his assertion, Dr Priestley is compelled to confess, (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 530,) that "this prophecy seems to represent the death of Christ, in the light of a satisfaction for sin."

But the emptiness of the position is not more clearly evinced by this passage, and other parts of the Old Testament which might be adduced, than by the language of our Saviour and his apostles, in those very parts of the New Testament to which this writer chooses to confine his search, the Gospels and Acts. For, when the angel declares to Joseph, that "his name shall be called Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins," (Matt. i. 21;) when John, who was sent to announce the Messiah, and to prepare men for his reception, and from whom a sketch at least of our Saviour's character, and the nature of his mission, might be expected, proclaims him, "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world," (John, i. 29,) thus directing the attention of his hearers to the notion of sacrifice and atonement, (see No. XXV;) when we find Saint John (xi. 50—52,) relating the saying of Caiaphas, that it was expedient "that one man should die *for* the people, *and that the whole nation perish not*;" and remarking on this, that Caiaphas had said this under a prophetic impulse, for that "Jesus should die for that nation, *and not for that nation only*, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God, that were scattered abroad;" when we find our Lord himself declare, that he "came to give his life a ransom for many," (Matt. xx. 28;) and again, at the last supper, an occasion which might be supposed to call for some explanation of the nature and benefits of the death which he was then about to suffer, using these remarkable words, "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins," (Matt. xxvi. 28;) which words Dr Priestley himself admits (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. pp. 345, 346,) to imply, "that the death of Christ in some respects resembles a sin-offering under the law;"—when, I say, these passages are to be found, all referring, more or less directly, to the notion of atonement; when it is considered, also, that this notion of atonement was rendered perfectly familiar by the law; and when to these reflections it is added, that the prophecy of Isaiah, to which reference is made in some, possibly in all of these, had, by describing Christ as a *sin-offering*, already pointed out the connection between the atonements of the law, and the death of Christ; there seems little foundation for the assertion, that nothing whatever appears in the Gospels or Acts, to justify the notion of atonement.

But admitting, for the sake of argument, that no instance to justify such a notion did occur; what is thence to be inferred? Are the many and clear declarations on this head, in the Epistles of Saint Paul, Saint Peter, and Saint John, to be pronounced surreptitious? Or, have these writers broached doctrines for which they had no authority? Let Dr Priestley take his choice. If he adopt neither part of the alternative, his argument goes for nothing.

But why, it may still be urged, are not the communications upon this subject as frequent and forcible in the Gospels and Acts, as in the Epistles? Why did not our Lord himself unfold to his hearers, in its fullest extent, this great and important object of his mission?—Why, I ask in return, did he not, at his first coming, openly declare that he was the Messiah? Why did he not also fully unfold that other great doctrine, which it was a principal (or as Dr Priestley will have it, *Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 175, the sole) "object of his mission to ascertain and exemplify, namely, that of a resurrection and a future state?" The ignorance of the Jews at large, and even of the apostles themselves, on this head, is notorious, and is well enlarged upon by Mr Veysie, (*Bampt. Lect. Serm.* pp. 188—198.) There seems, then, at least as much reason for our Lord's rectifying their errors, and supplying them with specific instructions on this head, as there could be on the subject of atonement.

But, besides, there appears a satisfactory reason why the doctrine of atonement is not so fully explained, and so frequently insisted on, in the discourses of our Lord and his apostles, as in the epistles to the early converts. Until it was clearly established that Jesus was the Messiah, and until, by his resurrection crowning all his miraculous acts, it was made manifest that he who had been crucified by the Jews, was he who was to save them and all mankind from their sins, it must have been premature and useless to explain how this was to be effected. To gain assent to plain facts was found a sufficient trial for the incredulity and rooted prejudices of the Jews in the first instance. Even to his immediate followers our Lord declares, "I have many things to say to you, but ye cannot bear them now," (John, xvi. 12.) And accordingly, both he and they afterwards, following his example, proceeded by first establishing the fact of his divine mission, before they insisted upon its end and design, which involved matters more difficult of apprehension and acceptance. Besides, it should be observed that the discourses of our Lord and his apostles were generally addressed to persons to whom the ideas of atonement were familiar; whereas the epistles were directed to those who were not acquainted with the principles of the Mosaic atonement; excepting only that addressed to the Hebrews, in which the writer solely endeavours to prove that the death of Christ falls in with those notions of atonement which were already familiar to the persons whom he addressed.

But Dr Priestley is not content to confine himself to those parts of Scripture where a full communication of the doctrine of atonement was least likely to be made. Having from long experience learnt the value of a confident assertion, he does not scruple to lay down a position yet bolder than the former; namely, "that in no part either of the Old or New Testament, do we ever find asserted or explained, the principle on which the doctrine of atonement is founded; but that, on the contrary, it is a sentiment every where abounding, that repentance and a good life are *of themselves* sufficient to recommend us to the favour of God," (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 263.) How little truth there is in the latter part of the assertion, has been already considered in Numbers IX and XVIII. That the former part is equally destitute of foundation, will require but little proof. The entire language of the epistles is a direct contradiction to it. The very prophecy which has been the principal subject of this Number, overturns it. It is in vain that Dr Priestley endeavours to shelter this assertion under an extreme and exaggerated statement of what the principle of atonement is; namely, "that sin is of so heinous a nature, that God cannot pardon it without an adequate satisfaction being made to his justice."

It is an artifice not confined to Dr Priestley, to propound the doctrine in these rigorous and overcharged terms, and at the same time to combat it in its more moderate and qualified acceptation; thus insensibly transferring to the latter, the sentiments of repugnance excited by the former. But, that God's displeasure against sin is such, that he has ordained that the sinner shall not be admitted to reconciliation and favour, but in virtue of that great Sacrifice which has been offered for the sins of men, exemplifying the desert of guilt, and manifesting God's righteous abhorrence of those sins which required so severe a condition of their forgiveness; that this, I say, is every where the language of Scripture, cannot possibly be denied. And it is to no purpose that Dr Priestley endeavours, by a strained interpretation, to remove the evidence of a single text, when almost every sentence that relates to the nature of our salvation, conveys the same ideas. That text, however, which Dr Priestley has laboured to prove, in opposition to the author of "*Jesus Christ the Mediator*," not to be auxiliary to the doctrine of atonement, I feel little hesitation in re-stating, as explanatory of its true nature and import. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, for the remission of past sins, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that he might be *just*, and (*i. e.* although) the *justifier* of him that believeth in Jesus," (Rom. iii. 25, 26.)[28]

---

[28] I had, in the former editions of this work, adopted Primate Newcome's explanation of the word *δικαιοσύνη*; conceiving the idea of *justification*, or method of justification, to be better calculated than that of *righteousness* (the term employed by the common version) to convey an adequate sense of the original. On perusing the observations of Dr Nares, in his *Remarks on the Unitarian Version of the New Testament*, pp. 150—153, I am now induced to alter my opinion; being fully satisfied, that that learned and ingenious writer has caught the true spirit of the original passage; and that the object of the inspired reasoner is not so much to shew, how, in the method adopted for the remission of sins, mercy was to be displayed, as how, notwithstanding this display of mercy, justice was to be maintained. In either view, the sense undoubtedly terminates in the same point, the reconciling with each other the two attributes of mercy and justice; but the emphasis of the argument takes opposite directions; and that, in the view which Dr Nares has preferred it takes the right direction, must be manifest on considering, that, in the remission of sins, mercy is the quality that immediately presents itself, whilst justice might seem to be for the time superseded. On this principle of interpretation, the sentence will stand thus:—"Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, for the manifestation of his *justice* (his just and righteous dealing) concerning the remission of past sins, through the forbearance of God: for the manifestation, at this time, of his *justice*, that he might be *just*, and (i. e. although) the *justifier* of him that believeth in Jesus." The justice of the Deity, or his regard to what is righteous and just, is thus declared not to have been departed from in the scheme of redemption: this scheme bearing a twofold relation to sinners, in such a manner, that, whilst it manifested the mercy of God, it should, at the same time, in no degree, lay a ground for the impeachment of his justice. This view of the case will be found exactly to agree with what has been already advanced at p. 59. The reader, who will turn to the *Annotations of Diodati*, p. 117, will be pleased with the observations which he will there find upon this subject.

Having been led by the discussion of this text to the mention of Dr Nares's work, I cannot avoid expressing my regret, that the present edition has travelled thus far on its way to the

To argue here, as is done by Dr Priestley and others, that the word δίκαιος, cannot mean *just* with regard to *punishment*, will avail but little in evading the force of this passage. Admitting even that it signifies, as Dr Priestley contends, *righteous*, the argument remains much the same; since, in this view, the reasoning of Saint Paul goes to reconcile with the righteous dealings of God, which, in respect of sin, must lead to punishment,—that forgiveness granted through Christ's propitiation, whereby the sinner was treated as if he had not offended, or was *justified*. This sense of the word *just*, namely, acting agreeably to what is right and equitable, cannot be objected to by Dr Priestley, it being that which he himself adopts, in his violent application of the word, as relating to the Jews, compared with the Gentiles.

Dr Doddridge deserves particularly to be consulted on this passage. See also Raphelius. The interpretation of δίκαιος in the sense of *merciful*, adopted by Hammond, Taylor, Rosenmüller, and others, seems entirely arbitrary. Whitby says, that the word occurs above eighty times in the New Testament, and not once in that sense.

The single instance adduced in support of this interpretation is itself destitute of support. It is that of Matt. i. 19,—"Joseph being a just man, and not willing to make Mary a public example, was minded to put her away privily." Now this means clearly, not, that Joseph being a *merciful*[29] man, and therefore not willing, &c. but, that being a *just* man, that is, actuated by a sense of right and duty, he determined to put her away according to the law, in Deut. xxiv. 1; and yet, at the same time, not willing to make her a public example, he determined to do it privately. See Lightfoot and Bishop Pearce on this passage.

That the force of *tamen*, yet, or nevertheless, which has been here ascribed to the word καὶ, is given to it both by the New Testament and profane writers, has been abundantly shewn by Raphel. tom. ii. p. 519; Palairet, pp. 41, 96, 221, 236; Elsner, tom. i. p. 293; and Krebsius, p. 147.—See also Schleusner *Lex. in Nov. Test.* No. XI. and the observations at p. 59, of this volume.

No. XLIII.—Page 16. Col. 1.

ON THE INCONSISTENCY OF THE REASONING WHEREBY THE DEATH OF CHRIST IS MAINTAINED TO HAVE BEEN BUT FIGURATIVELY A SACRIFICE.

It has been well remarked, that there is great inconsistency in the arguments of some writers upon this subject. They represent

---

public eye, without those aids which an earlier appearance of that valuable performance would have secured to it. Being, like that respectable writer, engaged in the endeavour to vindicate the purity of Scripture truth from Unitarian misrepresentation, I am naturally desirous to avail myself of the exertions of so distinguished a fellow-labourer. That, therefore, the cause which is here supported, may not be altogether deprived of the advantages of such co-operation on the subjects which have been already discussed in the foregoing sheets, I shall here subjoin a reference to those parts of Dr Nares's work which bear upon the same subjects, and bestow upon them additional enforcement and illustration. I beg, then, to direct the reader's attention to pp. 60—124, 173, 174, 181, 182, 217, 220, on the doctrine of the *pre-existence* treated of in No. I.—to pp. 126—130, 231—236, 154—164, on the *ransom* or *price of redemption* treated of in No. XXV, on the sense in which Christ is said to have been made a *sacrifice for sin*, and a *sin-offering*, as in No. XXVII, pp. 64, 65, and No. XXIX. and to have died *for us*, as in No. XXX.—to pp. 144—154, on the meaning of *propitiation*, as treated of in No. XXVI. and of *atonement*, as in No. XXVIII.—and, lastly, to pp. 131—140, on the meaning of the phrase *bearing sins*, which has been treated of in the present Number.

I have referred the reader to the discussion of these several subjects in Dr Nares's work, not only because the view which has been taken of them in the preceding Numbers will be found thereby to receive ample confirmation; but, more especially, because the arguments employed by the learned author are shaped in such a manner, as to meet the Unitarian objections in that form, in which they have made their latest appearance, and which has been given to them by the joint labours and collective erudition of the party. In the year 1801, a challenge had been thrown out to the Unitarians, in the first edition of the present work, (see p. 49,) calling upon them for an avowed translation of the Scriptures on their peculiar principles. Whether it has been in compliance with this demand or not, that they have given to the world their *Improved Version of the New Testament*, is of little consequence. But it is of great consequence, that they have been brought to reduce their vague and fluctuating notions of what the New Testament contains, to some one determined form; and that they have afforded to the able author of the *Remarks* upon their version an opportunity of exposing the futility of the criticisms, the fallaciousness of the reasonings, the unsoundness of the doctrines, and the shallowness of the information, which have combined to produce this elaborate specimen of Unitarian exposition. Spanheim has said, Controversiæ quæ cum hodiernis Socinianis, vel Anti-Trinitariis etiam extra familiam Socini, intercedunt, sive numero suo, sive controversorum capitum *momento*, sive adversariorum fuco et larvâ quadam pietatis, sive argutiarum nonnunquam subtilitate, sive Socinianæ luis *contagio*, in gravissimis merito censentur. (*Select. de Relig. Cont.* p. 132.) If this observation of Spanheim is admitted to be a just one, the friends of Christianity cannot surely be too thankful to the compilers of the *Improved Version*, for bringing together into one view the entire congeries of their cavils on the New Testament; nor to the *Remarker* upon those cavils, for their complete and triumphant refutation.

[29] Campbell, although, from his not discerning the adversative relation of the members of the verse, Matt. i. 19, he has not ascribed to the word the signification of *just* in this place, is yet obliged to confess that he has "not seen sufficient evidence for rendering it *humane*, or *merciful*:" *Four Gospels*, &c. vol. iv. pp. 6, 7. The force of the Syriac word which is here used for δίκαιος, seems not to have been sufficiently attended to in the decision of this question. If the learned reader will take the trouble of examining the several passages in the Syriac New Testament, where the word ܟܐܢ, or its emphatic ܟܐܢܐ, occurs, he will be satisfied that in every case where it does not signify *just* in the most rigorous sense, it at least implies that which is founded in *right*. For its use in the former acceptation, see John, v. 30; vii. 24; Rom. ii. 5; iii. 26; 2 Thess. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 8; Apoc. xix. 2.

the death of Christ, not as a *proper*, but merely as a *figurative*, sacrifice ; and establish this by proving, that it cannot be either. For, whilst they argue that it is not a *proper* sacrifice, upon principles which tend to shew that no such sacrifice can exist, they prove at the same time that it is not a sacrifice *figuratively*, since every figure presupposes reality. The writers of the New Testament, who perpetually apply the sacrificial terms to the death of Christ, must surely have been under a strange mistake, since neither in a proper, nor in a figurative sense, did those terms admit of such application.

Upon the whole, the opposers of the proper sacrifice of Christ, on the ground of necessary inefficacy, are reduced to this alternative,—that no proper sacrifice for sin ever existed, and that, consequently, in no sense whatever, not even in figure, is the death of Christ to be considered as a sacrifice ; or, that the efficacy, which they deny to the sacrifice of Christ, belonged to the offering of a brute animal.

Besides, if they allow the sacrifices under the law to have been proper sacrifices, whilst that of Christ was only figurative, then, since the apostle has declared the former to have been but types and shadows of the latter, it follows, that the proper and real sacrifices were but types and shadows of the improper and figurative.

On the pretence of *figurative* allusion, in the sacrificial terms of the New Testament, which has been already so much enlarged upon in several parts of this work, Dr Laurence, in his discourse on *The Metaphorical Character of the Apostolical Style*, has thrown out some valuable ideas, which well deserve to be considered.

No. XLIV. — Page 16. Col. 1.

ON THE NATURE OF THE SACRIFICE FOR SIN.

I have not scrupled to adopt this definition, as it stands in the 2d vol. of *Theol. Rep.* Numb. 1 : to the judicious author of which paper I am indebted for some valuable reflections on this subject. On the true nature of the sacrifice for sin, see also, Hallet's *Discourses*, 2d vol. p. 293. Although both these writers, in adopting the premial scheme of atonement, endeavour to establish a principle entirely different from that contended for in these discourses, yet are the observations of both upon the subject of atonement particularly worthy of attention.

No. XLV. — Page 16. Col. 2.

ON THE EFFECT OF THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT IN PRODUCING SENTIMENTS FAVOURABLE TO VIRTUE AND RELIGION.

Dr Priestley (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 419,) offers, upon this head, some very extraordinary remarks. He admits, that "the apprehensions of the divine justice, and of the evil and demerit of sin," excited by the scheme of redemption here maintained, are "sentiments of powerful effect in promoting repentance and reformation." But he adds, that, "in proportion as any opinion raises our idea of the justice of God, it must sink our idea of the divine mercy ;[1] and since a sense of the mercy of God is, at least, as powerful an inducement to repentance, and as efficacious a motive to a holy life, especially with ingenuous minds, as the apprehension of his justice, what the doctrine of atonement gains on the one hand, it loses on the other."

Now, does Dr Priestley seriously think, that the abstract love of excellence, or the hope of distant reward, can produce upon the minds of men impressions as powerful as the habitual fear of offending? That the desire of happiness acts upon us but through the medium of present inquietude ; that we seek after it, only in the degree in which we feel uneasy from the want of it ; and that fear is in itself, however remote its object, an instant and perpetually acting stimulus, Dr Priestley is too well acquainted with the nature of the human mind not to admit. And, I apprehend, he would consider that civil government but badly secured, which rested upon no other support than that of gratitude and the hope of reward, rejecting altogether the succour of judicial infliction. But, besides, in comparing the effects, upon the human mind, of gratitude for the divine mercies, and fear of the divine justice, it is to be remembered, that one great advantage, which we ascribe to the latter, is this, that those humble feelings, which the apprehension of the great demerit of sin, and of the punishment due to our offences, must naturally excite, dispose us the more readily to place our whole reliance on God, and, not presuming on our own exertions, to seek in all cases his sustaining aid. Farther, admitting that the bulk of mankind, (who, after all, and not merely ingenuous minds, are, as Dr Priestley confesses, "the persons to be wrought upon,") were as strongly influenced by love of the goodness of God as by fear of his justice, it by no means follows, that "the doctrine of atonement must lose in one way what it gains in another;" because it is not true, that "the fear of the divine justice must sink our ideas of the divine mercy." On the contrary, the greater the misery from which men have been released, the greater must be their gratitude to their deliverer. And thus, whilst the divine rectitude rendered it unavoidable that the offender should be treated in a different manner from the obedient, the mercy which devised a method whereby that rectitude should remain uninfringed, and yet the offender forgiven, cannot but awaken the strongest feelings of gratitude and love.

---

[1] Bishop Watson, in speaking of that arrogant and dogmatical theology, that decrees the rejection of the doctrine of the atonement as inconsistent with the divine attribute of mercy, uses the following just observations : — "We know assuredly, that God delighteth not in blood ; that he hath no cruelty, no vengeance, no malignity, no infirmity of any passion in his nature ; but we do not know whether the requisition of an atonement for transgression may not be an emanation of his infinite mercy, rather than a demand of his infinite justice. We do not know, whether it may not be the very best means of preserving the innocence and happiness not only of us, but of all other free and intelligent beings. We do not know, whether the suffering of an innocent person may not be productive of a degree of good, infinitely surpassing the evil of such sufferance ; nor whether such a quantum of good could, by any other means, have been produced." — *Two Apologies*, &c. pp. 466, 467.

Dr Priestley, however, contends, that even the advantage ascribed to the doctrine of atonement, namely, that of exciting apprehensions of the divine justice and of the evil and demerit of sin, does not strictly belong to it; "for, that severity should work upon men, the offenders themselves should feel[2] it. Now, this I cannot understand. It seems much the same as to say, that, in order to feel the horror of falling down a precipice, on the edge of which he hangs, a man must be actually dashed down the steep. Will not the danger produce sensations of terror? And will not the person who snatches me from that danger be viewed with gratitude, as having rescued me from destruction? Or is it necessary that I should not be saved, in order to know from what I have been saved? Can any thing impress us with a stronger sense of God's hatred to sin, of the severe punishment due to it, and of the danger to which we are consequently exposed if we comply not with his terms of forgiveness, than his appointing the sacrifice of his only begotten Son, as the condition on which alone he has thought it right to grant us forgiveness? Do we not in this see every thing to excite our fear? do we not see every thing to awaken our gratitude?

No. XLVI. — Page 17. Col. 2.

ON THE SUPPOSITION THAT SACRIFICE ORIGINATED IN PRIESTCRAFT.

Some of those objectors, who call themselves enlightened, but whose opinions would scarcely deserve notice, were it not to mark their absurdity, have sagaciously conjectured, that sacrifice was the invention of priestcraft. Morgan (*Moral Phil.* p. 236) and Tindal (*Christ. as old as the Creat.* p. 79) exult in this discovery. But, in the elevation of their triumph, they have totally forgotten to inform us who were the priests in the days of Cain and Abel; or, if we consent to set aside the history of that first sacrifice, in compliance with the dislike which such gentlemen entertain for the book in which it is contained, we have still to learn of them, in what manner the fathers and heads of families (by whom, even Morgan himself confesses, sacrifices were first offered) contrived to convert the oblation of their own flocks and fruits into a gainful traffic. And, indeed, after all, the priests, or, as he calls them, "holy butchers," whom Tindal wittily represents, "as sharing with their gods, and reserving the best bits for themselves," seem to have possessed a very extraordinary taste.. The skin of the burnt-offering among the Jews, (Levit. vii. 8,) and the skin and feet among the heathens, (Pott. *Antiq.* vol. i. book ii. ch. 3,) being the best bits, which the priests cunningly reserved for their own use.[1]

Such impotent cavils, contemptible as they are, may yet be considered of value in this light. They imply an admission, that the invention of sacrifice on principles of natural reason is utterly inconceivable; since, if any such principles could be pointed out, these writers, whose main object is to undermine the fabric of Revelation, would gladly have resorted to them, in preference to suppositions so frivolous and absurd.

---

[2] The "ne non timere quidem sine aliquo timore" of Tully, seems an idea quite inconceivable to Dr Priestley. On this subject I beg to direct the reader's attention to the words of the late Bishop Porteous, and particularly to the striking and beautiful expression in the concluding clause, taken from Scott's *Christian Life:* — "By accepting the death of Christ instead of ours, by laying on him the iniquity of us all, God certainly gave us the most astonishing proof of his mercy; and yet, by accepting no less a sacrifice than that of his own Son, he has, by this most expressive and tremendous act, signified to the whole world such extreme indignation at sin, as may well alarm, even while he saves us, and make us tremble at his severity, even while we are within the arms of his mercy." Porteous's *Sermons*, ii. p. 56.

[1] See Delany's *Revel. Exam.* vol. i. pp. 86, 87, and Kennicott's *Two Dissert.* pp. 204, 205.

No. XLVII. — Page 17. Col. 2.

ON THE SUPPOSITION THAT THE MOSAIC SACRIFICE ORIGINATED IN HUMAN INVENTION.

Among the supporters of this opinion there are undoubtedly to be reckoned many distinguished names: Maimonides, R. Levi Ben Gerson, and Abarbanel, amongst the Jews; and amongst the early Christians, Justin Martyr, the author of the questions and answers to the Orthodox in his works, Irenæus, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Cyril of Alexandria; who all concur in pronouncing the divine institution of the Mosaic sacrifices to have been an accommodation to the prejudices of the Jewish people, who had been trained up in the practice of sacrifice among the Egyptians; to whom Porphyry attributes the invention of sacrifice; whilst others ascribe its origin to the Phenicians. To the above names are to be added, of later date, those of Grotius, Spencer, and Warburton.

But to suppose that these most solemn rites of worship should have been ordained by a God of infinite wisdom and purity — by a God, who presents himself to the Jews, in the character of a king jealous of his glory — merely in compliance with the absurdities of pagan superstition, seems a notion little worthy of the names that have been mentioned. To imagine, also, that the sacrifices of the patriarchs could have received the divine approbation, without the authority of divine institution, is to contradict the general tenor and express language of Scripture; which supplies various instances, in which God resented, and severely punished, every species of will-worship, (as for example, in the case of Nadab and Abihu, who were struck dead for burning incense with strange fire,) and which expressly condemns in Matt. xv. 9, and Col. ii. 22, 23, that ἐθελοθρησκεία, which sprang from the devices and inventions of men.

Spencer, indeed, who has most laboriously defended this notion of the human invention of sacrifices, in his book *De Leg. Hebr.*, has endeavoured to prove, (lib. iii. diss. ii. cap. 4. sect. 2,) that Saint Paul speaks of will-worship without disapprobation.[1] In this, however, he is completely answered by Witsius:[2] and with respect to the circumstance of resemblance between the Jewish religion and those of the ancient heathen nations, on which the reasoning of Spencer through the entire of his voluminous work is founded, Shuckford asserts, that, so far is it from justifying the inference which he has drawn, namely, that God had instituted the one in imitation of the other, that the direct contrary is the legitimate conclusion; inasmuch as "no one ceremony can be produced, common to the religion of Abraham or Moses, and to that of the heathen nations, but that it may be proved, that it was used by Abraham or Moses, or by some of the true worshippers of God, earlier than by any of the heathen nations." (*Connection*, &c. vol. i. p. 317.)

It is to be remarked, that to those who have been already named as supporting the hypothesis of the human invention of sacrifice, are to be added, in general, the writers of the Popish church; who, in order to justify their will-worship, or appointment of religious rites without divine institution, allege the example of the Patriarchs in the case of sacrifices, and the approbation bestowed by God upon these acts of worship, though destitute of the sanctions of his command.

One writer of that church (a writer, however, whom she will not be very ambitious to claim) has, indeed, carried this point yet farther; inasmuch as he contends not only for the human invention of sacrifice, but for its mere human adoption into the Jewish ritual, without any divine sanction or authority whatever. The words of this writer, which, I confess, I think worth quoting, merely for the same reason for which the Spartan father exhibited his drunken Helot, are these: — "That the Supreme Being would imperiously require of mankind bloody victims, and even point out the particular animals that were to be immolated upon his altar, it is, to me, highly incredible ; but that superstition, the child of ignorance and fear, should think of offering such sacrifices, it is not at all wonderful : nor need we think it strange, that Moses, although a wise legislator, in this indulged the humour of so gross and carnal a people as were the Israelites. All the nations around them offered similar victims, from the banks of the Euphrates to the banks of the Nile. The Egyptians, in particular, among whom they had so long sojourned, not only sacrificed animals to their gods, but selected the best of their kind. Indeed, I have ever been convinced, since I was capable of reflection, that the whole sacrificial and ceremonial laws of Moses were chiefly borrowed from the priests of Egypt, but prudently accommodated by the Hebrew legislator to the relative situation of his own people, divested of profane licentiousness and barefaced idolatry, and restrained to the worship of one supreme God, who created the heavens and the earth, and whom *he was pleased to call* Ieue, Iao, *or* Jehovah !"[3]

---

[1] An argument, which has been used by Spencer in support of this opinion, deserves particularly to be exposed. In speaking of the notion of the sacrifice of Abel having been the consequence of a divine institution and command, he thus expresses himself; "Sententia hæc erroris inde manifesta est quod hoc ipso in commate (Heb. xi. 4,) illius oblata, non debita, sed δῶρα, ab Apostolo appellentur: nam inde patet, Abelis oblationem e pio voluntatis propriæ motu, potius quam legis alicujus præscripto prodisse." Spenc. *De Leg. Hebr.* ii. 769. Here it is directly contended, that the authority of the writer to the Hebrews gives support to the assertion, that the offering of Abel was purely voluntary; and this is deduced from the force of the term δῶρα, employed by that writer in the passage in the epistles above referred to. But the learned author is altogether inexcusable in drawing such a conclusion: inasmuch as it can hardly be supposed, that he was unaware of the sense in which the writer to the Hebrews has applied the term δῶρα, in every other passage in which it occurs throughout the Epistle; namely, as referring to oblations under the Mosaic law, which consequently were the result of specific institution, and in which no one part even of the ceremonial of the oblation was left to the free choice of the offerer. Nor can it easily be believed, that the author could have been ignorant, that in above seventy passages of the Old Testament the word δῶρα is used by the LXX for the Hebrew קרבן; in every one of which passages nearly the oblation under the prescription of the Levitical ritual is intended to be conveyed; and indeed the word קרבן is the most general name for the sacrifices under the Mosaic law. See what is said on this word in No. LXII. The true and obvious reason why the writer to the Hebrews uses the term δῶρα, is, because it is the very term employed by the Seventy in describing the offerings of both Cain and Abel in Gen. iv. 4, 5. The author of the Epistle, treating of the same subject, naturally uses the same language.

[2] *Misc. Sac.* lib. ii. diss. ii. § 2—7. See also Heideg. *Hist. Patriarch. Exercit.* iii. § 52, tom. i.

And again, this same enlightened expositor of Holy Writ unfolds, much to the credit of the Jewish legislator, the great advantages attending his imposition of Egyption ceremonies as matter of divine ordinance upon his

---

[3] Geddes's *Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures*, p. 309. The observations which this extraordinary writer, who wishes to be distinguished by the title of a *Catholic Christian*, subjoins to the passage above referred to, will serve still farther to shew the true nature of his claims to that denomination : — " This name, (he says, alluding to the name Jehovah,) I think, he (Moses) must have learnt in Midian : that he could not learn it in Egypt is clear from this, that the name was not known there before he announced it as the name of the *God of the Hebrews ;* and Jehovah himself is made to say, on Mount Sinai, that he had never till then manifested himself by that name : but that the name before that was known in Midian, nay, that it was the name of the Deity, whom Jethro principally, or perhaps exclusively, worshipped, to me appears very probable from several circumstances." Having enumerated these circumstances, which enable him to pronounce that Moses had put a gross falsehood into the mouth of Jehovah upon this subject, he concludes thus : — " From all this I think it probable, that the name Jehovah was known in Midian, Moab, and Syria, before the mission of Moses ; and that Moses may have borrowed it thence. Those who literally believe what is related in the third chapter of Exodus will sneer at this remark ; and they are welcome so to do : I will never be angry with any one for *believing either too much* or *too little.*"

Now, if we follow this writer to his *Remarks* upon the third chapter of Exodus, we shall learn what it is that he considers as *believing just enough.* Moses, in that chapter, informs us of " the angel of the Lord appearing to him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush ;" — and of the divine mission then expressly conveyed to him by God himself speaking out of the burning bush, and describing himself as " the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Now, what says Dr Geddes on this ? " That in his apprehension, there might, in this particular apparition, be no other angel or messenger, than an uncommon luminous appearance in a bush of briars ; which attracted the attention of Moses, and might be considered by him as a divine call to return to Egypt for the purpose of delivering his brethren from their iron bondage." Then having proved the propriety of calling this " luminous appearance in the bush of briars," the angel of the Lord, and even God himself, from the passage in the Psalmist, " The Lord maketh the winds his messengers, and flames of fire his ministers ;" and recollecting the necessity of explaining how this *luminous appearance*, or *flaming angel*, was enabled to hold in the name of the Most High a long and distinct conversation with Moses, he boldly faces about and meets the difficulty at once. — " But can it be believed, that the whole dialogue, contained in this and the following chapters, is founded upon the single phenomenon of a fiery meteor or luminous appearance in a bush of briars ? What may appear credible or incredible to others, I know not ; but I know, that I can believe this, sooner than believe that God and Moses verbally conversed together in the manner here related, on the bare authority of a Jewish historian, who lived no one can well tell when or where ; and who seems to have been as fond of the marvellous as any Jew of any age. But let every one judge for himself, as he has an undoubted right to do ; and believe as much, or as little, as pleaseth him. — My belief is my own."

Such is Dr Geddes's enlightened view of this part of Scripture, on which the claim of the Jewish legislator to a divine mission is founded. He states, indeed, with a modesty truly becoming, that his belief upon the subject is purely his own. So, I will venture to add for him, it will ever remain. For although some may be found, whose reach of philosophical reflection may just serve to enable them, with Dr Geddes, to reject the narrative of Moses as a fabrication, and his pretensions to a divine mission as an imposture ; yet that nice discriminating taste in miracles, that could catch the flavour of a nearer approach to credibility in the case of a burning bush of briars carrying on a long conversation in the name of the Almighty, than in the case of that great Being directly communicating his will and issuing his commands to one of his intelligent creatures respecting a great religious dispensation to be introduced into the world by human agency, — is likely to secure to Dr Geddes an eminence in singularity from which he is in no great danger of experiencing the slightest disturbance.

I cannot, however, yet dismiss this subject, and still less can I dismiss one so serious with an air of levity. However ludicrous and however contemptible the wild fancies and the impotent scoffs of this traducer of Scripture truths may be, yet the awful importance of that sacred book with which he has connected himself in the capacity of translator, bestows upon his labours, by association, a consequence, which (barely) rescues them from present neglect, though it cannot operate to secure them from future oblivion. In the declaration of his creed, (*Pref. to Crit. Rem.* p. vi.) and in the vindication of himself from the charge of infidelity, he affirms, " the Gospel of Jesus to be his religious code ; and his doctrines to be his dearest delight ;" he professes himself to be " a sincere though unworthy disciple of Christ." " *Christian* (he says) is my name, and *Catholic* my surname. Rather than renounce these glorious titles, I would shed my blood," &c. Now, in what does this *Catholic Christianity* consist ? Not merely, as we have seen, in denying the divine mission of Moses, and in charging the messenger of that dispensation which was the forerunner of Christianity, with the fabrication of the most gross and infamous falsehoods, but in attributing to our Lord himself a participation in those falsehoods by their adoption and application to his own purposes in his conferences with the Jews. For the establishment of this, it will be sufficient to appeal to our Lord's solemn attestation to the truth of Moses's narrative of the transaction alluded to. " And as touching the dead, that they rise : have ye not read in *the book of Moses*, how in the bush *God spake unto him*, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob ?" (Mark, xii. 26.) What the *Catholic Christianity* of Dr Geddes amounts to, may be sufficiently inferred from the comparison of this single passage with the positions which he maintains in direct opposition to the authority of our Lord himself.

But it will appear still more satisfactory from a short summary of his services in the cause of Holy Writ, presented to us by the pen of an accurate and judicious writer, in the pages of a well-known periodical publication : — " The method taken by this *Catholic Christian*, of strengthening the foundation of the faith of Christians, seems very extraordinary. For it consists in tearing up all the foundations which the learning and the piety of the divines of former ages had been employed to lay. It would perhaps be doing more justice to his great enterprise to people. "This concession must have been extremely agreeable to a sensual, grovelling people. The transition from the habits which they had contracted in Egypt was an easy one. The object of their worship was changed, *but little of its mode: for it is not now a question among the learned,* whether a great part of their ritual were not derived from that nation." (Geddes's *Preface to Genesis*, p. xiii.) Thus easily is the whole matter settled by this modest, cautious, and pious commentator.

Now what says Dr Priestley upon this question, which has been so completely set at rest by the learned? "They who suppose that Moses himself was the author of the institutions, civil or religious, that bear his name, and that in framing them he borrowed much from the Egyptians, or other ancient nations, *must never have compared them together;* otherwise they could not but have perceived many circumstances in which they differ most essentially from them all." He then proceeds, through a dissertation of some length, to point out the most striking of those differences: and among these he notices the sacrificial discrepancies as not the least important.

"Sacrificing (he says) was a mode of worship more ancient than idolatry or the institutions of Moses; but among the heathens various superstitious customs were introduced respecting it, which were all excluded from the religion of the Hebrews." Having evinced this by a great variety of instances, he observes,—"As Moses did not adopt any of the heathen customs, it is equally evident that they borrowed nothing from him with respect to sacrifices. With them we find no such distinction of sacrifices as is made in the books of Moses, such as burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, and peace-offerings, or of the heaving or waving of the sacrifices. Those particulars, therefore, he could not have had from them, whether we can discover any reason for them or not. They either had their origin in the time of Moses, or, which is most probable, were prior to his time, and to the existence of idolatry."—"Lastly (he remarks,) among all the heathens, and especially in the time of Moses, *human sacrifices* were considered as the most acceptable to the gods: but in the laws of Moses, nothing is mentioned with greater abhorrence; and it is expressly declared to have been a principal cause of the expulsion of the idolatrous inhabitants of Canaan. The right of the Divine Being to claim such sacrifices is intimated by the command to sacrifice Isaac, but it was declined, and a ram substituted in his place. Also, when the Divine Being claimed the first-born of all the Israelites, in the place of those of the Egyptians which were destroyed, none of them were sacrificed; but the service of the Levites was accepted instead of them: and whereas there were not Levites enow for that purpose, the rest were redeemed by the sacrifice of brute animals, which evinced the determination of the Divine Being in no case to accept of that of men."

---

say, that it is an attempt to tear up the foundations which the Spirit of God has laid. He attacks the credit of Moses in every part of his character, as an historian, a legislator, and a moralist. Whether Moses was himself the writer of the Pentateuch, is, with Dr Geddes, a matter of doubt. But the writer, whoever he might be, is one, he tells us, who upon all occasions gives in to the marvellous, adorns his narrative with fictions of the interference of the Deity, when every thing happened in a natural way; and at other times dresses up fable in the garb of true history. The history of the creation is, according to him, a fabulous cosmogony. The story of the Fall, a mere Mythos, in which nothing but the imagination of commentators, possessing more piety than judgment, could have discovered either a seducing devil, or the promise of a Saviour. It is a fable, he asserts, intended for the purpose of persuading the vulgar, that knowledge is the root of all evil, and the desire of it a crime. Moses was, it seems, a man of great talents, as Numa and Lycurgus were. But, like them, he was a false pretender to personal intercourse with the Deity, with whom he had no immediate communication. He had the art to take advantage of rare but natural occurrences, to persuade the Israelites that the immediate power of God was exerted to accomplish his projects. When a violent wind happened to lay dry the head of the gulf of Suez, he persuaded them that God had made a passage for them through the sea; and the narrative of their march is embellished with circumstances of mere fiction. In the delivery of the Decalogue he took advantage of a thunderstorm, to persuade the people that Jehovah had descended upon Mount Sinai; and he counterfeited the voice of God by a person, in the height of the storm, speaking through a trumpet. He presumes even that God had no immediate hand in delivering the Israelites from the Egyptian bondage. The story of Balaam and his ass has had a parallel in certain incidents of Dr Geddes's own life. The laws of Moses are full of pious frauds. His animal sacrifices were institutions of ignorance and superstition. The conquest of Canaan was a project of unjust ambition, executed with cruelty; and the morality of the Decalogue itself is not without its imperfections. In the end he comes to this very plain confession,—'The God of Moses, Jehovah, if he really be such as he is described in the Pentateuch, is not the God whom I adore, nor the God whom I could love.'" &c. (*Brit. Critic*, vol. xix. pp. 3, 4.)

Such are the views of the Hebrew Scriptures entertained by the man who undertook to be their translator; and who, to these qualifications for the task, superadded those of a low and ludicrous cast of mind, a vulgar taste, and an almost total unacquaintance with the idiom of the English language. Whether, then, upon the whole, I have dealt unjustly by this writer, in exemplifying his profane ravings by the brutal intoxication of the Spartan slave, and in conceiving the bare exhibition of the one to be sufficient like that of the other to inspire horror and disgust, I leave to the candid reader to determine. If, however, any taste can be so far vitiated, or any judgment so weak, as to admit to serious and respectful consideration that perversion of the sacred volume which he would dignify with the title of a translation, I would recommend at the same time a perusal of the learned and judicious strictures upon that work contained in the 14th and 19th volumes of the journal from which the above extract has been made; a journal, to which every friend of good order and true religion in the community must feel himself deeply indebted. As a powerful antidote against the poison of the work, Dr Graves's *Lectures on the Four Last Books of the Pentateuch*, whilst embracing much larger and more important objects, may be most usefully applied. In this valuable performance the authenticity and truth of the Mosaic history are established; the theological, moral, and political principles of the Jewish law are elucidated; and all are, with ability and success, vindicated against the objections of infidels and gainsayers.

He finishes the entire disquisition by saying, "It may now, surely, be concluded, from this general view of the subject, that the two systems, namely, that of Moses, and that of the heathens, were not derived from each other: and the superiority of that of Moses is so great, that, considering his circumstances and those of his nation at the time, we cannot err in pronouncing, that *they could not have had any human, but must have had a divine origin.* Nor can any thing be said of Mr Langles, and others, who assert that the books of Moses were copied, or in any other way derived, from the works of other Eastern nations, more favourable than that they had never read them."[4]

Such is Dr Priestley's opinion upon the subject, on which Dr Geddes comforts himself with having the unanimous suffrage of the learned in his favour. In truth, the absurdity of Dr Geddes's notions on this subject, exposed as they have so frequently been when advanced by other infidel writers, (for with such I must beg leave to class this *Catholic* translator of the "*books held sacred*,") I should not have deemed entitled to any specific refutation: but I could not resist the opportunity of confronting him with a brother critic, equally removed from the trammels of received opinions, and equally intrepid in exercising the right of free inquiry in the face of whatever consequences might result. — When Greek meets Greek ——

There is another writer also, for the purpose of confronting whose opinions with those of Dr Priestley I have been the more desirous of making the foregoing extracts from this author's *Dissertation*; — and that is no other than Dr Priestley himself. Whoever will be at the trouble of perusing his positions relative to sacrifices contained in Number V. of this work, and also his observations on their origin alluded to in the Number which follows this, will have no small reason to be surprised at the orthodox complexion of the arguments which have just been cited. For the striking inconsistency which will present itself upon such a comparison, it may not perhaps be difficult to account. I am willing, (and with much satisfaction in the reflection) to believe, that, as Dr Priestley approached the close of life, and was enabled, by being withdrawn from the fermentation of controversy and party, to view these awful subjects with the calmness, deliberation, and seriousness, which they demand, his religious opinions might have undergone some change, and made some approach to that soberer interpretation of Scripture which at an earlier period he had with almost unaccountable pertinacity resisted. I think I can discover strong signs of this in the comparative moderation of his last work, *Notes on all the Books of Scripture*; but especially in the *Dissertation on the Originality and superior Excellence of the Mosaic Institutions*, from which I have made the foregoing quotations, and which (although I cannot concur in the entire of its contents) I would strongly recommend, as containing a judicious summary of the internal evidence of the divine origin of the Mosaic institutions.

No. XLVIII. — Page 17. Col. 2.

SACRIFICES EXPLAINED AS GIFTS BY VARIOUS WRITERS.

Spencer maintains this theory of sacrifice: *De Leg. Hebr.* lib. iii. diss. ii. cap. 3. sect. 1, 2. pp. 762, 763. Mr Coventry, in the fifth discourse of his *Philem. and Hydasp.* pp. 91, 92, 108, 109, adopts the same idea, clothing it, in his manner, with circumstances tending to disparage and vilify the entire rite. The author of the *Scripture Account of Sacrifices* proposes what he deems a different theory; but which is distinguished from this, by a line so faint, as scarcely to be discerned. "*Religious gifts*," he says, "should be kept carefully distinct from gifts *weakly* presented to God, as men would offer gifts to one another:" and he explains sacrifices to be "sacred gifts, of things received first from God, and presented back to him for an external expression of gratitude, acknowledgment, faith, and every pious sentiment," (pp. 78—82, and *Postsc.* p. 21.) This notion, however, seems to have no just connection with any species of sacrifice, but the eucharistic. And however the sentiment of gratitude might have led to an offering of things inanimate, it could not have suggested the idea of the slaying of an animal, as was done by Abel at the beginning. Besides, this notion of sacrifice includes the idea of *property*, and is consequently not conceivable, without admitting an actual experience of the gratifying effect produced by gifts upon men: and thus it falls under the objection urged in Number LI. against the idea of *gifts* in general.

Dr Priestley has adopted a similar theory, asserting that sacrifices arose from anthropomorphitical notions of God, and are to be considered originally as *gifts* of gratitude. Like the last named author, he endeavours to support his notion from the practice of gifts of homage to great persons in early times;

---

[4] *A Dissertation, in which are demonstrated the Originality and superior Excellence of the Mosaic Institutions*, contained in Dr Priestley's *Notes on all the Books of Scripture*, vol. i. pp. 373—400. See also the preface, p. xii. in which Dr Priestley uses these words: — "The divine mission of Moses and that of Jesus are inseparably connected; and the religion of the Hebrews and that of the Christians are part of the same scheme; so that the separation of them is impossible. That Dr Geddes, and some others, should have been of a different opinion, appears to me most extraordinary."

and, like him, he considers, of course, an offering for sin as differing in no respect from any other sort of oblation. The progress of the rite of sacrifice, as growing out of the notion of gifts, he has traced in a circumstantial and elaborate detail, (*Th. Rep.* vol. i. pp. 195—201,) which, whoever wishes to be convinced of the utter improbability of the theory in its most plausible colouring, may take the trouble to consult.

H. Taylor, (*B. Mord.* pp. 799—804,) in like manner, deduces sacrifices from the notion of gifts; pronouncing them to have been nothing but free-will offerings of the first fruits of the earth, or fold; and he expressly defines sacrifice to be "a sacred gift, set apart to God, whereby the sacrificer shewed his readiness to part with his property to religious uses, and thereby openly and publicly manifested his worship of God." He thus totally excludes the received notion of atonement; and, agreeably to this, he subjoins, that "atonement and propitiation had no other meaning or design, than to *purify*, or *sanctify*, or *set apart*, any person or thing to the service of God, by separating them from common use."

It is evident, that every explication here given of the theory of gifts carries with it the idea of a *bribe* to God to procure his favour. In some, it is disguised under the appearance of an expression of gratitude or homage, but this is evidently the essential ingredient, especially in all such sacrifices as were of a deprecatory nature. But, that such a notion was neither likely to obtain in the days of the first recorded sacrifice, nor has any connection with the ideas known to be universally attached in later days to animal *piacular* sacrifice, it will not require much thought to discover.

No. XLIX.—Page 17. Col. 2.

SACRIFICES CONSIDERED AS FEDERAL RITES.

Sykes, in his *Essay on Sac.* p. 59, explains sacrifices as "federal rites," and represents them as "implying, the entering into friendship with God; or the renewal of that friendship, when broken by the violation of former stipulations;" and in p. 73, he says, that the origin of sacrifices may be accounted for on the supposition, "that eating and drinking together were the known ordinary symbols of friendship, and were the usual rites of engaging in covenants and leagues;" this mode of entering into friendship and forming leagues with each other, being transferred by the ancients to their gods; and in confirmation of this, he adduces instances from Homer, Virgil, Max. Tyr. and others, to shew, that they imagined that their gods did actually eat with them, as they ate with their gods. Thus, according to Sykes, Cain and Abel must both have eaten of the offerings which they brought; and this, indeed, he positively asserts, p. 179. But not only have we no authority from Scripture to presume this, but, as we shall see in No. LII. there is good reason to suppose directly the contrary.

It should follow, also, from this theory, that all those who offered sacrifices, antecedent to the Mosaic institution, must in completion of the ceremony have feasted upon the offering. Of this, however, no intimation whatever is given in Scripture. Jacob, indeed, is said to have called his brethren to eat bread; but it by no means follows, that this was part of the *sacrificial* ceremony. That he should invite his friends to partake in the solemnity of the sacrifice, and afterwards entertain them, is perfectly natural, and conveys no notion whatever of feasting with God at his table. But besides, the holocaust, or burnt-offering, was such as rendered it impossible that the sacrificer could feast upon it, the whole of the animal being consumed upon the altar; and that animal sacrifices, both before and a long time after the Flood, were of this kind, is generally acknowledged, (*Scrip. Acc. of Sac. postsc.* p. 32.) This difficulty, indeed, Sykes endeavours to evade, by saying, that the holocaust being deprecatory and offered on account of sins, it was to be entirely consumed by the offerer, and no part reserved for his own use, in confession that he did not think himself worthy to be admitted to eat of what was offered to God, (*Essay*, p. 232.) But now, if holocausts were the first sacrifices, it will scarcely be admitted, that an institution, which, for many ages after its commencement, absolutely precluded the possibility of feasting upon what was offered, should yet have taken its rise from that very idea. And besides, if the renewal of friendship, to be expressed by the symbol of eating with God, were the true signification of the sacrifice, to what species of sacrifice could it more properly apply, than to that whose precise object was reconciliation?

It deserves also to be remarked, that almost all the instances by which Sykes supports his theory are drawn from early heathen practices. Now, it is notorious, that animals unfit for food were sacrificed in several parts of the heathen world. Thus, horses were sacrificed to the sun; wolves to Mars; asses to Priapus; and dogs to Hecate. Besides, it is not easy to conceive, had eating and drinking with God been at any time the prevalent idea of sacrifice, how a custom so abhorrent from this notion as that of human sacrifice could ever have had birth. Nor will it suffice to say, that this was a gross abuse of later days, when the original idea of sacrifice had been obscured and perverted, (*Essay*, p. 347.) The sacrifice of Isaac, commanded by God himself, was surely not of this description; and it will not be asserted that this was a sacrifice intended to be eaten: nor does it appear that Abraham had prepared any meat or drink-offering to accompany it. —*B. Mord.* p. 814.

Upon the whole of Dr Sykes's reasoning in support of this theory it may be said, that he has transposed cause and effect, and inverted the order and series of the events. For whilst, from the custom of contracting leagues and friendships by eating and drinking at the same table, he deduces the practice of feasting upon the sacrifice, and thence concludes this to be the very essence and origin of the rite, he seems to have taken a course directly opposite to the true one; inasmuch as, in the first sacrifices, no part being reserved, it was not until long after the establishment of the rite, when many were invited to partake in the sacrifice, that feasting became connected with the ceremony; and having thus acquired a sacred import by association, it was probably transferred to compacts and covenants amongst men, to bestow solemnity upon the act. See *Scrip. Acc. of Sacr. postsc.* p. 33. Whoever wishes to see a full and perfect refutation of this theory of Dr Sykes, may consult the second appendix of Dr Richie's *Criticism upon Modern Notions of Sacrifice.*

It must, indeed, be confessed, that names of still higher authority are to be found on the side of the opinion which Sykes has adopted. Mede and Cudworth, in the course of their respective arguments to establish the Eucharist as a federal rite, had, long before the age of this writer, maintained the doctrine which he contends for; and in this they were followed, and their reasonings repeated, by Dr Waterland, in his *Nature, Obligation, and Efficacy of the Christian Sacrament considered.* The main strength of the argument is marshalled by Mede in the four following reasons, which the reader, from the great celebrity of that writer, will naturally be desirous to see.

"First, 'Every sacrifice,' saith our Saviour, (Mark, ix. 49,) 'is salted with salt.' This salt is called, (Lev. ii. 13,) 'the salt of the covenant of God;' that is, a symbol of the perpetuity thereof. Now, if the salt which seasoned the sacrifice, were 'sal fœderis Dei, — the salt of the covenant of God,' what was the sacrament itself but 'epulum fœderis, — the feast of the covenant?' —— Secondly, Moses calls the blood of the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, wherewith he sprinkled the children of Israel when they received the Law, the blood of the covenant which the Lord had made with them: 'This is,' saith he, 'the blood of the Covenant which the Lord hath made with you,' (Exod. xxiv. 8.) — Thirdly, But, above all, this may most evidently be evinced out of the 50th Psalm, the whole argument whereof is concerning sacrifices: there God saith, verse 5, 'Gather my saints together unto me, which make covenant with me by sacrifice:' and verse 16, of the sacrifices of the wicked, 'Unto the wicked God saith, what hast thou to do to declare my statutes, and take my covenant in thy mouth, seeing thou hatest instruction?' &c.—Fourthly, I add in this last place, for a farther confirmation, that when God was to make a covenant with Abram, (Gen. xv.) he commanded him to offer a sacrifice, verse 9, 'Offer unto me (so it should be turned) a heifer, a she-goat, and a ram, each of three years old, a turtle dove, and a young pigeon.' All which he offered accordingly, and *divided* them in the midst, laying each piece or moiety one against the other; and when the sun went down, God, in the likeness of a smoking furnace and burning lamp, *passed between the pieces,* and so (as the text says) 'made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed will I give this land,' &c. By which rite of *passing between the parts,* God condescended to the manner of men." The author then proceeds to shew, that this custom of dividing the sacrifice and passing between the parts was usual with the Gentiles, and not unknown among the Jews: and, upon the whole, he concludes as a matter decisively established, that sacrifices were in their nature and essence "*federal feasts,* wherein God deigneth to entertain man to eat and drink with or before him, in token of favour and reconcilement." (*Works of* Joseph Mede, p. 170 — 172.)

The opinions and arguments of a divine so learned, and a reasoner so profound, as Joseph Mede, should not be approached but with reverence: yet upon close examination it must be evident that this great man has here arrived at a conclusion not warranted by his premises. For, as to his first argument, it manifestly proves no more than this, that the Jewish sacrifices, which were all offered under and in reference to the covenant which God had originally made with the Jews, (Lev. ii. 13, and Exod. xxiv.) were always accompanied with that which was considered to be a symbol of the perpetuity of that covenant. In this there was evidently nothing *federal,* nothing which marked the entering into a present covenant, or even the renewing of an old one; but simply a significant and forcible assurance of the faithfulness of that great Being with whom the national covenant of the Jews had been originally entered into.

If this reasoning be just, and I apprehend it cannot be controverted, the whole strength of the cause is gone: for the remaining arguments, although they undoubtedly establish this, that *some* sacrifices were of the nature of *federal rites,* yet they establish no more: so that the general nature of sacrifice remains altogether unaffected. In those cases, also, where the sacrifice appears to have had a federal aspect, the true state of the matter is probably this, that where there was a covenant, there was a sacrifice also to give solemnity and obligation to the covenant; sacrifice being the most solemn act of devotion, and therefore naturally to be called in for the enforcement of the religious observance of any compact engaged in. Thus, the sacrifice, being but the accompaniment of the covenant, does not necessarily partake of its nature. In other words, although it be admitted, that where there was a covenant there was also a sacrifice, it by no means follows, that wherever there was a sacrifice there was also a covenant. That *some* sacrifices, therefore, had a federal relation, proves nothing as to the nature of sacrifice in general: and the conclusion, which we had before arrived at, remains, consequently, unshaken by the reasons which have been adduced by Mede.—Bishop Pearce's *Two Letters to Dr Waterland* may be read with advantage upon this subject; although they contain many particulars in which the reflecting reader will probably not concur.

No. L.—Page 17. Col. 2.

BISHOP WARBURTON'S THEORY OF THE ORIGIN OF SACRIFICE.

Bishop Warburton (*Div. Leg.* B. ix. ch. 2.) represents the whole of sacrifice as symbolical. The offerings of first-fruits he holds to be an action expressive of gratitude and homage: and in this way he accounts for the origin of such sacrifices as were eucharistic. But, aware of the insufficiency of the theory, which places the entire system of sacrifice on the ground of gifts, he proceeds to explain the nature of expiatory sacrifice in the manner described in the page to which this Number refers.

It is to be lamented, that an ingenious writer of whom I have had occasion in another place to speak in terms of commendation, should in his view of the Bishop's opinions upon this subject, have permitted himself to give support to that, which is certainly not among the most tenable of his Lordship's notions;—namely, the idea of the human origin of sacrifice. This, too, (though probably not so intended by the author,) has been done in a way which has a powerful tendency to mislead the unwary reader: the professed object being to exhibit an impartial enumeration of the arguments on both sides of the question, whilst, in truth, a preponderating weight has been studiously cast in favour of one. I allude to Mr Pearson's *Critical Essay;* in the 4th section of which the reasonings of Spencer and Warburton, in defence of the heathenish origin and subsequent divine adoption of the rite of sacrifice, are treated with a complacency which they but ill deserve. The reasonings themselves, as they are elsewhere in this work largely discussed, I shall not here stop to consider.

No. LI.—Page 18. Col. 1.

THE SUPPOSITION THAT SACRIFICES ORIGINATED IN THE IDEA OF GIFTS, ERRONEOUS.

Dr Rutherforth, in a communication to Dr Kennicott, collects from Gen. iv. 20, that the introduction of property, or exclusive right, amongst mankind, is not to be fixed higher than the time of Jabal, the eighth from Adam. He is there said to have been the father, or first inventor, of מקנה: that is, says Rutherforth, not as we translate it, "the father of such as have cattle," (for he was clearly not the first of such, Abel having been a keeper of sheep long before,) but of private property; the word מקנה signifying strictly *possession* of any sort, and being so rendered in the Syriac version. (Kennic. *Two Dissert.* App. p. 252—254.) In addition to this it may be remarked, that the word מקנה seems to have been applied to *cattle*, merely because cattle were, in the earliest ages, the only kind of *possession;* and that, when there is nothing in the context to determine the word to that application, it can be considered only in its original and proper sense, namely, *possession.*

But whether this idea be right or not, it is obvious that a community of goods must have for some time prevailed in the world; and that, consequently, the very notion of a gift, and all experience of its effect upon men, must have been for a length of time unknown. And if the opinion be right, that sacrifice existed before Abel, and was coeval with the Fall; it becomes yet more manifest, that observation of the efficacy of gifts could not have given birth to the practice, there being no subjects in the world upon which Adam could make such observation. Besides, as Kennicott remarks, (*Two Diss.* p. 207,) "no being has a right to the lives of other beings, but the Creator, or those on whom he confers that right:" if then God had not given Abel such a right, (and that he did not confer it even for the purposes of necessary food, will appear from the succeeding Number,) even the existence of the notion of property, and the familiar use and experience of gifts, could not have led him to take away the life of the animal as a gift to the Almighty; nor, if they could have done so, can we conceive that such an offering would have been graciously accepted.

No. LII. — Page 18. Col. 1.

ON THE DATE OF THE PERMISSION OF ANIMAL FOOD TO MAN.

The permission of animal food evidently appears from Scripture to take its date from the age of Noah: the express grant of animal food then made, clearly evincing that it was not in use before. This opinion is not only founded in the obvious sense of the passage Gen. ix. 3, but has the support of commentators, the most distinguished for their learning and candid investigation of the sacred text.[1] But, as ingenious refinements have been employed to torture away the plain and direct sense of Scripture upon this head, it becomes necessary to take a brief review of the arguments upon the question.

Two grants were made; one to Adam, and one to Noah. To Adam it was said, (Gen. i. 29, 30,) "Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth; and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree, bearing seed, to you it shall be for meat; and to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat." Again, to Noah it is said, (Gen. ix. 3,) "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; *even as the green herb have I given you all things.*" Now, whilst the obvious inference from the former of these passages is, that God's original grant of the use of his creatures for food, was confined to the vegetable creation; the conclusion to be drawn from the latter is found to be precisely similar, inasmuch as, had animal food been before permitted for the use of man, there had been no occasion for the specific grant to that purpose now made to Noah. And, in perfect agreement with this reasoning, we find the Scripture history of the period antecedent to the Flood entirely silent concerning the use of animal food.

Dr Sykes, however, can see nothing in the first grant to Adam, "but a general declaration of a sufficient provision for all creatures;" nor in the second to Noah, "but a command to slay before they ate flesh:" flesh having from the first been used for food. (*Essay*, &c. pp. 177, 178.) In support of these extraordinary positions he employs arguments not less extraordinary.

1. He contends, that the former grant is necessarily to be understood with certain limitations; for that, as some creatures were not formed for living on herbs, and some herbs were of a poisonous quality, the grant cannot be supposed to extend to every green herb; and hence he infers, that the grant cannot be interpreted as enjoining or prohibiting any particular species of food; and that, consequently, animal food may be included, (p. 169—171.) But it seems rather a strange inference, even admitting the existence of noxious vegetables at the time of the grant, that, because it must in propriety be limited to a certain description of the things generally permitted, it might therefore be extended to a class of things never once named; or that, because a full power was given to man over all herbs, to take of them as he pleased for food, whilst some would not answer for that purpose, the dominion given was not, therefore, to relate to herbs, but generally to all things that might serve for human sustenance.

But, 2. he maintains, that, at all events, this grant of herb and tree for the food of man, does not exclude any other sort of food which might be proper for him. And, to establish this, he endeavours to shew (p. 171—177,) that the declaration to Noah did not contain a grant to eat animal food in general, but only some particular sorts of it, such as are included in the word רמש, by which he understands creeping things, or such animals as are not comprehended under the denominations of beast and fowl; so that, admitting this to be a grant of something new, it was yet by no means inconsistent with the supposition, that sheep, oxen, goats, and such like animals, had been eaten from the first. Now, this directly contradicts his former argument. For if, as that maintains, the grant to Adam was but a general declaration of abundant provision, and consequently leaving man at full liberty to use all creatures for food, why introduce a permission at this time respecting a particular species of creatures?

But besides, רמש does not imply a particular species of animals, but denotes *all*, of whatever kind, *that move.* That this is the true acceptation of the word may be collected from Cocceius, and Schindler, as well as Nachmanides, (who is quoted by Fagius, *Crit. Sac.* on Gen. i. 29,) and the several authorities in Poole's *Syn.* on Gen. ix. 3: and so manifest does it appear from the original in various instances, that it requires no small degree of charity not to believe that Dr Sykes has wilfully closed his eyes against its true meaning. His words are particularly deserving of remark. "Throughout the law of Moses, it is certain, that it (רמש) never takes in, or includes, beasts of the earth, or birds of the air, but a third species of animals different from the other two:" and this third species he conjectures to be, "all such, either fish or reptiles, that not having feet glide along," (p. 173.) Now the direct contrary of all this is certain: and had Dr Sykes, in his accurate survey of the entire law of Moses, but allowed his eye to glance on the words contained in Gen. vii. 21, he probably would not have been quite so peremptory. "*All flesh* died, that moveth (הרמש) upon the earth; both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing (שרץ) that creepeth (השרץ) upon the earth." Here the creeping things are specially named, and included, together with all other creatures, under the general word רמש. And it is particularly deserving of notice, that in the 11th chapter of Levit., in which the different species of animals are accurately pointed out, those that are properly called *creeping things* are mentioned no less than eleven times, and in every instance expressed by the word שרץ: and yet from this very chapter, overlooking these numerous and decisive instances, Dr Sykes quotes, in support of his opinion, the use of the word רמש in the two following verses: "Neither shall you defile yourselves with any manner of creeping thing (שרץ) that moveth (הרמש) upon the earth," verse 44.—And again, "this is the law of the beasts, and of the fowls, and of every living creature that moveth (הרמש) in the waters," verse 46. Here, because the word רמש, which is a description of all moving things, (as has been shewn above, and may be proved from various other instances,—see Jenn. *Jew. Antiq.* vol. i. p. 306,) is found connected with reptiles and fishes, it is at once pronounced to be appropriate to them; notwithstanding that through the entire chapter, whose object it is carefully to distinguish the different kinds of animals, it is never once used in the numerous passages referring specially to the reptile and fishy tribes as their proper appellation, and is translated in these two verses by the LXX in its true generic sense, *κινούμενος*, "that moveth." So that Dr Sykes might with as good reason have inferred, that, because creeping things are occasionally called living creatures, living creatures must, consequently, mean creeping things. To say the truth, if Dr Sykes had been desirous to discover a part of Scripture, completely subversive of his interpretation of the word רמש, he could not have made a happier selection than the very chapter of Leviticus to which he has referred.

---

[1] See Munst. Vatab. Clar. Grot. and Le Clerc on Gen. ix. 3; also Shuckf. *Connect.* vol. i. p. 81; and Kennic. *Two Diss.* p. 70.

But, to leave no doubt that the grant made to Noah was a permission for the first time of animal food, we find an express description of the manner in which this sort of food was to be used immediately subjoined: "But flesh with the life thereof, shall ye not eat." Now, if animal food had been before in use, this injunction seems unaccountable, unless on the supposition, that it had been the practice, before the Flood, to feed on the flesh of animals that had not been duly killed for the purpose; and Dr Sykes's argument, which maintains, that this prohibition merely tended to prevent the eating such animals as died of themselves, or the eating the animal without having duly killed it, must rest entirely on the presumption that such had been the practice before. But on what ground he has assumed this, he has not thought proper to inform us: and the certainty, that, before the Flood, animals were killed for sacrifice, seems not consistent with the supposition. It is curious to observe, that this argument adduced by Sykes falls in with one of the strange conceits of the Jewish Rabbins; it being a tradition of theirs, that there were seven precepts handed down by the sons of Noah to their posterity, six of which had been given to Adam, and the seventh was this to Noah, "about not eating flesh, which was cut from any animal alive." See Patrick's *Preface to Job*—also Jennings's *Jew. Antiq.*, vol. i. p. 147.

It must be confessed, however, that arguments of a nature widely different from these of Sykes, have been urged in opposition to the interpretation of the several grants to Adam, and to Noah, contended for in this note. Heidegger, in his *Historia Patriarch. Exercit.* xv. § 9, vol. i. maintains, that the passage (Gen. i. 29, 30) is to be thus translated: "Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, &c. (to you it shall be for meat;) *nay, also*, every beast of the earth, and every fowl of the earth, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth wherein there is life, *with* every green herb for meat." This translation he defends, on the ground of the occasional use of the preposition ל, in the inclusive, or copulative, sense; whence he holds himself justified in explaining it here, as the mark of the accusative, not of the dative case. In support of this acceptation, he also produces some names highly distinguished in the annals of sacred criticism, namely, Capellus, Cocceius, and Bochart. And to reconcile this interpretation with the grant to Noah, which seems inconsistent with the idea that the right to animal food had been conveyed before the time of that patriarch, he considers this second grant but as a repetition of the first to Adam, and that the words, "even as the green herb have I given you all things," are not to be understood as conveying now, for the first time, a right to the use of all creatures, similar to that which had been before granted with respect to the herbs and fruits, but merely as confirming the grant formerly made, of the green herb and of all living creatures, without distinction.

Now, although the particle ל is used in some few parts of Scripture, in the sense here ascribed to it by Heidegger, yet if we examine the instances in which it is so applied, (all of which may be seen at one view in Noldius *Concord. Particul. Ebr.* pp. 398, 401,) we shall find, that it stands in those cases combined and related in such manner as to give a new modification to its general and ordinary meaning. But, surely, in the present case, no such modifying relation exists On the contrary, the very frame and analogy of the sentence seem to determine the word to its usual dative signification. Having occurred twice in the 29th verse, and in both places manifestly in this sense, (לכם, " to you,") it then immediately follows in direct connection, and this connection marked most unequivocally by the copulative particle ו, (ולכל,) so as to determine unavoidably the continuance of its application in the same sense. The word את, likewise, succeeds to the clauses enumerating the animal tribes in the 30th verse, precisely in the same manner in which it followed that relating to the human kind, in the preceding verse; and as, there, it is admitted to be the mark of the accusative, specifying the things allotted to the sustenance of the *human* species; so, here, it is evidently to be used in the same sense, specifying those things that are appointed for the support of the *brute* creation. This analogy, however, Heidegger is compelled by his interpretation to overturn; and whilst he allows to the word this signification through the whole of the preceding verse, he here abruptly and arbitrarily changes its application, and attributes to it the force of *with*, which is necessary to make sense of the passage, according to his mode of translating it.

How, then, does the matter stand? In two passages exactly corresponding, and immediately connected, the preposition ל, and the particle את, are arbitrarily applied in different senses, to make out the translation of Heidegger; whilst on the commonly received interpretation, the anology is preserved throughout, and the same uniform meaning is attributed to each particle in the corresponding clauses. Indeed, the version contended for by Heidegger is, upon the whole, so violent and unnatural, that it requires but to read the passage in the original, to be convinced that it is inadmissible; and perhaps nothing but the respectability of the names that appear in its support, could justify its serious investigation. One advantage, however, manifestly attends the notice of it in the present discussion. It proves, that the learned writers, who defend this interpretation, consider the commonly received version as utterly irreconcileable with the notion, that the first grant to Adam conveyed the permission of animal food. For if any of the arguments used by Dr Sykes, and others, to shew that it could be so understood, were deemed by these writers to have any value, they surely would not have resorted to this new and unwarrantable translation in support of that position.

In addition to what has been said, it may be proper to remark, that this new version of Gen. i. 29, 30, is so far from receiving any countenance from the Jewish writers, that they are nearly unanimous in the opinion, that the right of eating flesh was not granted until the time of Noah. See particularly Abenezra, and Sol. Jarchi, in their annotations on this part of Scripture. Heidegger also confesses, that the Christian Fathers, nearly without exception, concur in the same opinion. *Hist. Patriarch. Exercit.* xv. § 3.

Objections, however, are drawn from the history of Abel's sacrifice; and from the distinction of animals into clean and unclean, antecedent to the Flood. It is said, that Abel's sacrifice having been of the firstlings of his flock, and it never having been customary to offer any thing to God, but what was useful to man, it may fairly be concluded, that animals were used for food even in the time of Abel. Heideg. *Hist. Patr. Exer.* xv. § 25. To this the reply is obvious; that the principle here laid down is accommodated to particular theories of sacrifice,—to such as place their origin and virtue in the notion of a gift to the Deity, or of a self-denial on the part of the offerer; and therefore the argument presupposes the very thing in question, namely, the origin and nature of sacrifice. But, besides, the conclusion will not follow, even admitting the principle; since Abel's flock might be kept for the advantages of the milk and wool, and thus what he offered was useful to himself. Nor to this can it reasonably be objected, that, by the practice of the law, the male firstlings were offered, and that therefore Abel's offering could have deprived him only of the wool, the use of which might not yet have been learned; for it cannot with propriety be contended, that the first and more simple form of sacrifice should be explained by the usages of succeeding and far distant times, and by the complicated system of the law of Moses.

But, again, it is urged, that the distinction of creatures into clean and unclean, (Gen. vii. 2,) proves animal food to have been in use before the Deluge, inasmuch as such distinction can be conceived only in reference to food. To this it has been answered by Grotius,[2] that the distinction was made proleptically, as being addressed by Moses to those who were familiar with this distinction afterwards made by the law: and again, by Jennings, (*Jew. Antiq.* vol. i. p. 151,) that such a distinction would naturally be made, from the difference observed to exist between the animals, without any reference to food; or that, though the use of them for food were held in view, the distinction might have been first made at the time of entering the ark, when we find it first mentioned, and a greater number of those that were most fit for food then preserved, merely because God intended

---

[1] *De. Ver. Chr.* lib. v. § 9.—See also Spencer *De. Leg. Hebr.* lib. i. cap. v. § 1.

o permit the use of them in a very short time. But reasonable as these answers may appear, may it not be thought more satisfactory, to consider this distinction as relating originally, not to food, but to sacrifice: those creatures, which were sanctified to the service and worship of God, being considered pure; whilst those that were rejected from the sacrificial service, were deemed unfit for sacred uses, or unclean? And agreeably to this idea, the word denoting "unclean," throughout the law, טמא, is put in opposition not only to טהר, "clean," but to קדש, "holy."[2] The distinction, then, of clean and unclean animals before the Flood, is admissible upon the principle of the divine institution, or even of the existing practice of sacrifice, without supposing the permission of animal food before the time of Noah.

In conformity with the above reasoning, we find the first use to which this distinction is applied in Scripture, is that of sacrifice; Noah having "taken of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings,"[3] (Gen. viii. 20.) Besides, it is to be remembered, that the distinction into clean and unclean with respect to *food*, was entirely a different institution from the distinction into clean and unclean with respect to *sacrifice*. (See Patrick and Ainsw. on Gen. vii. 2.) Dr Kennicott's remark on this subject is deserving of notice. "Although the distinction of beasts into clean and unclean was not registered until we come down to Deuteronomy, (xiv. 3,) yet," he says, "this is no reason why we should not suppose it introduced by God at the same time that he instituted sacrifice; for whoever considers carefully will find, that the law is in part a republication of antecedent revelations and commands, long before given to mankind." (*Two Dissert.* pp. 217, 218,—comp. Ainsw. on Gen. vii. 2.) Witsius considers the distinction of beasts into clean and unclean so manifestly to relate to sacrifice in the time of Noah, and to have originated from divine institution, that he even employs it as an argument in support of the divine appointment of sacrifice before the Flood. (*Miscell. Sacr.* lib. ii. diss. ii. § 14.) Heidegger also, though he contends for the use of animal food in the antediluvian world, yet admits the distinction of animals into clean and unclean, to have been instituted by divine authority, in reference to sacrifices before the Flood. *Hist. Patr. Exercit.* iii. § 52, tom. i.

No. LIII.—Page 18. Col. 1.

ON THE DIVINE ORIGIN OF LANGUAGE.

"The first use of words appears from Scripture to have been to communicate the thoughts of God. But how could this be done, but in the words of God? and how could man understand the words of God, before he was taught them?" The apostle has told us, that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;" thus clearly pronouncing all knowledge of divine things, and consequently all language relating to them, to have had its origin in revelation. But it is not only with respect to things divine, that revelation appears to have supplied the first intimations of language. In terms relating to mere human concerns, it seems to have been no less the instructress of man. For in what sense can we understand the "naming of every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, brought before Adam for this purpose by God," but in that of his instructing Adam in the manner whereby they were in future to be distinguished? To suppose it otherwise, and to imagine that Adam at the first was able to impose names on the several tribes of animals, is to suppose, either that he must from the first have been able to distinguish them by their characteristic marks and leading properties, and to have distinct notions[1] of them

---

[2] See Cocceius and Parkhurst on the word טמא.

[3] See Pol. *Synop.* on Gen. vii. 2; compare also Gen. xv. 9, with Jameson's note thereon.

[1] In speaking of the necessity of a distinct notion being associated to each term indicating a class or species, it is not meant to imply, that to render generic terms significant, appropriate abstract notions must be annexed. That such notions cannot be entertained by the mind, or, rather, that they involve a contradiction subversive of their existence, the very arguments and illustrations employed by Mr Locke in their support and explanation are sufficient to demonstrate. See particularly Locke's *Essay*, B. iv. ch. vii. § 9. It has been fully and conclusively established by that most accurate of metaphysical reasoners, Berkeley, that what is called a general idea, is nothing but the idea of an individual object, annexed to a certain term, which attaches to it a more extensive signification, by recalling to the mind the ideas of other individuals, which are similar to this one in certain characters or properties. This explanation of the nature of *Universals*, which has been commonly ascribed to Bishop Berkeley, who has, undoubtedly, unfolded and enforced it in the most intelligible and convincing manner, is, however, of much earlier origin. The distinction of *Nominalist* and *Realist* is known to have been clearly marked in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, under the teaching of Roscelin, and his pupil Abelard. The Cynics and Stoics, also, of early times, maintained opinions which entitle them to be ranked of the former class: and, contrary to the assertion of Mr Dugald Stewart, who follows the authority of Brucker in placing Aristotle among the Realists, there certainly are to be found in the writings of that philosopher the elements of those just notions concerning Universals, which have been adopted by the Nominalists.

Of Roscelin, we are told by Brucker, (*Hist. Phil.* vol. iii. p. 907,) that he maintained the position, "Universalia, nec ante rem, nec in re existere, nec ullam habere realem existentiam, sed esse nuda nomina et voces, quibus rerum singularium genera denotentur." This opinion of Roscelin, that Universals annexed to their several appellations; or, that he applied sounds at random, as names of the animals, without the intervention of such notions. But the latter is to suppose a jargon, not a language: and the former implies a miraculous operation on the mind of Adam, which differs nothing in substance from the divine instruction here contended for.

Indeed, even abstracting from the information thus given in Scripture, those who have well examined this subject have been utterly at a loss to conceive any other origin of language, than divine institution. Whitby considers this so completely evident, that he thinks it forms in itself a clear demonstration, that the original of mankind was as Moses delivered it, from the impossibility of giving any other tolerable account of the origin of language. (*Sermons on the Attrib.* vol. ii. p. 29.) Bishop Williams, in his 2d Sermon, (*Boyle Lect.* vol. i. p. 167,) affirms, that though Adam had a capacity and organs admirably contrived for speech, yet in his case there was a necessity of his being immediately instructed by God, because it was impossible

---

were merely words or names, was strenuously supported, with some small alteration not very distinctly intelligible, by his follower Abelard: and was no less strenuously opposed by the Realists, who contended, that Universals have an actual existence *in rerum naturâ*, and that their boundaries are accurately determined by appropriate essences, according to which Nature has classed the individuals of the respective species. That the authority of Aristotle was erroneously claimed by the latter; and that, on the contrary, the views of the Stagyrite were favourable to the Nominalists, Dr Gillies has taken laudable pains to demonstrate. In his valuable Analysis of a part of the writings of that philosopher, he has satisfactorily proved, that, by general terms, Aristotle meant only to express the result of the comparison of different individuals agreeing in the same εἶδος or appearance, without the supposition of any correspondent general ideas existing in the mind; or, in other words, that a general term was conceived by him, to stand as a sign for a number of individuals, considered under the same aspect, and, from certain resemblances, assigned to the same class. See Dr Gillies's *Aristotle*, vol. i. p. 66—72.

How perfectly this corresponds with the clearest views of modern metaphysics, is manifest at a glance: and it cannot but afford peculiar satisfaction to all who feel a reverence for exalted genius to find, that, after the unworthy disparagement which for a length of time has been so laboriously cast upon the great name of Aristotle, the honourable homage of a rational coincidence in his opinions, not merely on this, but on an almost endless variety of important subjects, has been the result of the most enlightened inquiries of later days. It has been singularly the fate of the Greek philosopher, to be at one time superstitiously venerated, and at another contemptuously ridiculed; without sufficient pains taken, either by his adversaries, or his admirers, to understand his meaning. It has been too frequently his misfortune to be judged from the opinions of his followers, rather than from his own. Even the celebrated Locke is not to be acquitted of this unfair treatment of his illustrious predecessor in the paths of Metaphysics; although, perhaps, it is not too much to say of his well known *Essay*, that there is scarcely to be found in it one valuable and important truth concerning the operations of the understanding, which may not be traced in those writings against which he has directed so much misapplied raillery; whilst, at the same time, they exhibit many rich results of deep thinking, which have entirely escaped his perspicacity. Indeed, it may be generally pronounced of those who have, within the last two centuries, been occupied in the investigation of the intellectual powers of man, that, had they studied Aristotle more, and (what would have followed as a necessary consequence) reviled him less, they would have been more successful in their endeavours to extend the sphere of human knowledge.

To return to the subject of this note,—it must be observed, that to the two different and opposite opinions on the nature of Universals already alluded to, namely, that of the Nominalists and that of the Realists, there is to be added a third and intermediate one, that of the Conceptualists, so called from their distinguishing tenet, that the mind has the power of forming general conceptions by abstraction. This sect is represented by Brucker, as a modification of that of the Nominalists. "Nominales, desertâ paulo Abelardi hypothesi, universalia notionibus, atque conceptibus mentis, ex rebus singularibus abstractione formatis, consistere statuebant: unde *Conceptuales* dicti sunt." *Hist. Phil.* vol. iii. p. 908.—With this sect Mr Locke is ranked by Dr Reid, (*Essays on the Intell. Powers*, vol. ii. p. 146,) and in the justness of this allotment Mr Dugald Stewart acquiesces. At the same time he observes, that, from the inaccuracy and inconsistency of Mr Locke's language, there is no small difficulty in assigning to him his true place; or rather, indeed, in determining whether he had any decided opinion on the question in dispute. (*Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, pp. 191, 192.) It, certainly, cannot be contended that Locke has conveyed his meaning upon this subject with clearness, or consistency; yet no doubt can possibly exist as to the class to which he properly belongs. His placing the essences of the species altogether in the abstract ideas formed by the mind, indisputably determines him to the standard of the Conceptualist; notwithstanding that the incompatibility of the elements of his abstract idea, (*Essay*, B. ii. ch. xi. § 9, and B. iv. ch. vii. § 9,) and the admitted necessity of the name to bestow upon the idea its unity, that is, in other words, its existence as an idea (*Essay*, B. iii. ch. v. § 10) marked the indistinctness of his views upon this subject; and ought, if he had examined his own notions consequentially, to have led him to adopt the party of the Nominalist.

From what has been said it appears, upon the whole, that the Nominalist and Conceptualist, whilst they concur in rejecting the notion of the Realist, "that Universals belong to things, and that general terms denote certain genera and species established in nature by appropriate essences,"—at the same time differ from each other, essentially, in this, that whilst the one attributes universality solely to terms, and the other to certain abstract ideas expressed by those terms, the latter admits the possibility of reasoning on general subjects without the mediation of language, and the former maintains the indispensable necessity of language, as the instrument of thought in all general speculations.

If, with Bishop Berkeley, we are obliged to deny the possible existence of an abstract idea, there can be no difficulty in determining to which of these two opinions we must yield our assent. In the sign alone, and in its potential application to a class of individual objects, is universality to be found; and consequently by language only, (meaning by this, the use of signs at large,) can we conduct our reasonings one single step beyond the individual object. There is, upon this subject, an excellent remark made by an elegant and perspicuous writer, which I cannot forbear transcribing:—"Whether it might not have been possible for the Deity to have so formed us, that we might have been capable of reasoning concerning classes of objects, without the use of signs, I shall not take upon me to determine. But this we may venture to affirm with confidence, that man is not such a being."——"It would be vain for us, in inquiries of this nature, to indulge ourselves in speculating about possibilities. It is of more consequence to remark the advantages which we derive from our actual constitution; and which, in the present instance, appear to me to be important and admirable: inasmuch as it fits mankind for an easy interchange of their intellectual acquisitions; by imposing on them the necessity of employing, in their solitary speculations, the same instrument of thought, which forms the established medium of their communications with each other."—See p. 190 of *Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, by Dugald Stewart.

he should have invented speech, and words o be spoken, so soon as his necessities required. Dr Beattie endeavours to prove the human invention of language to be impossible. (*Theory of Lang.* 8vo. p. 101.) And Dr Johnson is so decidedly of this opinion, hat he holds inspiration to be necessary to nform man that he has the faculty of speech, ‘ which I think,” says he, “ he could no more find out without inspiration, than cows or hogs would think of such a faculty.” Mr Wollaston contends, (*Relig. of Nat.* pp. 122, 123,) that language is the indispensable nstrument[2] of thought; and even Herder, who has laboured to prove language not to have been of divine appointment, admits, that without it reason cannot be used by man.

Now, if language be necessary to the exercise of reason, it clearly cannot have been the result of human excogitation; or, as it is put by Dr Ellis in his *Enquiry*, &c. language cannot be contrived without thought and knowledge; but the mind cannot have thought and knowledge, till it has language; therefore language must be previously taught, before man could become a rational creature; and none could teach him but God. (*Scholar Armed*, vol. i. p. 140.) Locke's principles

---

[2] In the preceding note, the necessity of language, as the nstrument of thought and reasoning, was particularly adverted o. In the judgment of many profound thinkers that necessity s recognized. Lavoisier, in the preface to his *Elements of Chemistry*, expresses his coincidence in the maxim of Condillac, hat “ we think only through the medium of words;” and that ‘ the art of reasoning is nothing more than a language well arranged.” (Kerr's *Translation*, p. xiv.) Plato describes thinking as conducted by mental speech, τὸ διανοεῖσθαι λόγον, ὃν αὐτὴ πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἡ ψυχὴ διεξέρχεται: and in the philosophy of the Greeks, reason and words are denominated by one and the same term, λόγος. Now, if this be just; if language be, in truth, the indispensable instrument of reasoning; is it too much to affirm, that language could not have been discovered by reasoning; or, in other words, that the operations of reasoning could not have effected that, by which alone its operations are conducted?

According to the Conceptualist, indeed, who holds that the mind can contemplate its own ideas independently of words, the invention of language by the exertion of thought is by no means inconceivable; since, on this hypothesis, reasoning may precede language, and therefore may minister to its discovery. And yet, when considered somewhat closely, it may not perhaps appear a very easy matter to imagine the practicability of such a process.

Reasoning, it is manifest, can be conducted only by propositions or affirmations, either verbal or mental. A proposition, affirming of any individual thing, that it is itself, or that it is not another, (could we even suppose the mind in its first stage of thinking capable of forming such a proposition,) is not to be ranked amongst the class of affirmations which belong to reasoning. The power of distinguishing individual objects pertains to the faculty of perception, and is necessary to reasoning, but can form no part of it. Nothing individual, then, being an attribute, every affirmation, which can make a part of reasoning, demands the existence of a general sign. The formation of general signs must, therefore, precede all affirmation, and consequently every exercise of the reasoning faculty. The Conceptualist, who asserts, that general signs are supplied by the general ideas with which abstraction furnishes the mind, must of course contend, that the exercise of the power of abstraction must be antecedent to every act of reasoning. Now, in the first place, it cannot but be deemed extraordinary, that the very faculty, which is pronounced to be the distinguishing characteristic of the rational species, should be called into action previous to the exercise of reason. If such a faculty can be exerted before the use of reason, why not exerted without it? And, in that case, why should not the tribes of irrational animals, whose perceptions of individual objects may be as distinct as those in the minds of men, pass from those individual perceptions to universal ideas, if such transition can be made without the exercise of reason? But again, not to dwell upon this consideration, (since it may be pretended that it is abstraction itself which in its consequence produces rationality,) if we inquire, what it is that can put an unreasoning mind upon this process of abstraction; a process allowed by all to be difficult, and represented by some in such a light as makes it appear to embrace contradictions; it will not be very easy to give an answer. In contemplating things by classes, it is true, we both expedite the acquisition of knowledge, and facilitate its communication. But can these ends act upon a mind which has not yet begun to reason? Can the anticipations of knowledge become a motive, where it has not yet been learned what knowledge is; or, can the desire of communication constitute an incitement, where the very notion of the subject matter to be communicated has never yet been conceived? For it must be remembered, that, as we are now speaking of language as subsequent to reasoning, and of reasoning as subsequent to abstraction, we must conceive abstraction to be exerted, without any notion actually acquired either of reasoning or language, or any direction or forecast suggested by a reference to either. Abstraction, in short, in this view of the case, is a random and unintelligible movement, which is excited by no design, proposes no object, and admits no regulation. So irrational a foundation for a rational superstructure, cannot be deliberately maintained.

Dr Price, whose system imposed on him the necessity of upholding the existence of abstract ideas, as “ essential to all the operations of the understanding, and as being implied in every act of our judgment,” felt himself, at the same time, obliged, from the foregoing considerations, to deny that such ideas can be acquired by any mental process, such as that of abstraction. “ Were abstract ideas,” he observes, “ formed by the mind in any such manner, it seems unavoidable to conceive that it has them, at the very time that it is supposed to be employed in forming them. Thus, from any particular idea of a triangle, it is said we can form the general one: but does not the very reflection said to be necessary to this, on a greater or lesser triangle, imply, that the general idea is already in the mind?” (*Review of the principal Difficulties in Morals*, p. 37.) The learned Cudworth, in like manner, speaking of the understanding, as an artificer that is to fabricate abstract notions out of sensible ideas, demands, whether, “ when this artificer goes about his work, he knows what he is to make of them beforehand, and unto what shape to bring them. If he do not, he must needs be a bungling workman: but if he do, he is prevented in his designs, his work being already done to his hand: for he must needs have the intelligible idea of that which he knows or understands, already within himself.” (*Treatise concerning Eternal and Immutable Morality*, pp. 220, 221.) Mr Harris, also, is led, as he says, by the common account of the mode in which our ideas are generated in the mind, “ to view the human soul in the light of a crucible, where truths are produced by a kind of logical chemistry.” *Hermes*, pp. 404, 405. These writers are accordingly forced into the gratuitous supposition of a distinct faculty, for the origin of abstract ideas in the human mind. This Dr Price pronounces to be “ the faculty, whose natural object is truth.” (*Rev.* p. 37.) And Cudworth, from whom he has largely drawn, and whose mysterious solution of this difficulty he does not altogether reject, ascribes the origin of our abstract ideas to a certain “ perceptive power of the Noetical part of the soul, which, acting by itself, exerts from within the intelligible ideas of things virtually contained in its own cognoscitive power, that are universal and abstract notions, from which, as it were, looking downwards, it comprehends individual things.” *Treatise*, pp. 217, 218. Mr Harris, again, accounts for the existence of abstract ideas, by a “ connective act of the soul, by means of concerning the nature of language, although he did not see his way with sufficient clearness to lead him to the right conclusion, the last named writer proves to be perfectly correspondent to the above reasoning. (*Ibid.* pp. 138, 139.) And in an able work published at Berlin by Süsmilchius in 1766, the same principles are successfully applied to establish the same conclusion; namely, that the origin of language must have been divine. Even Hobbes admits, that "the first author of speech was God himself, that instructed Adam how to name such creatures as he presented to his sight." (*Leviath.* ch. iv. p. 12.)

From the impossibility of conceiving how language could have been invented, some have been led, in opposition to all just reasoning, to pronounce it innate.[3] Many even of the ancients, totally unaided by revelation, were obliged to confess that the discovery of this art exceeded all human powers. Thus Socrates, in the Cratylus of Plato, is represented as saying, "the first names were framed by the gods;" and in the same work we are told, that "the imposition of names on things belonged to a nature superior to that of man," and that it could "pertain only to him who hath a full discernment of their several natures."—Pol. *Syn.* on Gen. ii. 19; Stilling. *Orig. Sac.* B. i. ch. i. § 3; and Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* lib. xi. cap. 6.

It must be remarked, that they who hold the opinion that language is of mere human invention are, for the most part, obliged to proceed on suppositions of the original state of man, totally inconsistent with the Mosaic history. Thus, amongst the ancients, Diodorus Siculus, (*Biblioth.* lib. i.) Vitruvius, (*De Archit.* lib. ii. cap. 1, 2,) Lucretius, &c. ground their reasonings upon an idea, (derived from the atomic cosmogony of Moschus, Democritus, and Epicurus, which represented human beings as springing from the earth, like vegetables,) that men first lived in woods and caves like brute beasts, uttering only cries and indistinct noises, until gradual association for mutual defence brought with it at length conventional signs for communication. And the respectable and learned, though strangely fanciful, author of the *Origin and Progress of Language*, who is among the latest that have written in defence of this opinion, is compelled to admit, that the invention of language is too difficult for the savage state of man; and accordingly he holds, that men, having been placed originally in a solitary and savage state, must have been associated for ages, and have carried on some common work, and even framed some civil polity, and must have continued for a considerable length of time in that state, so as ultimately to acquire such powers of abstraction as to be able to form general ideas, before language could possibly be formed. Now, whether such theories, in supposing a mute emergence from savage barbarism to reflecting civilization, and a continued association[4] without an associating tie, prove any thing else than their own extravagance; and whether, by the prodigious difficulty and delay which even they attach to the invention of speech, they do not give strong confirmation to the Mosaic account, which describes man as destined for the immediate enjoyment of society, and consequently instructed in the art of speech, it is for the reader to judge.

Other writers again, for example, Condillac (in his *Essay on the Origin of Human Knowledge,*) Batteaux (in his *Principles of Literature,*) and Gebelin (in his *Monde Primitif,*) maintain, that man is not by nature the *mutum pecus* he is represented by the Scotch

---

which, by an energy as spontaneous and familiar to its nature as the seeing of colours is to the eye, it discerns at once, what in many is one; what, in things dissimilar and different, is similar, and the same:" and this "connecting or unifying power" of the mind, he makes to be the same with that which discerns truth: and by means of this alone it is, that he considers, that individuals themselves can become the objects of knowledge; in which he seems to coincide with the mystical notions of Cudworth. See *Hermes*, p. 360—372.

Into such extraordinary straits, and unjustifiable assumptions, have these learned and able writers been drawn, whilst they maintained the existence of universal ideas, and at the same time found it impossible to accede to the notion of their production by the process of abstraction. They would have reasoned more justly, if, from the impossibility of acquiring universal ideas by such a process, they had inferred that no such ideas do actually exist in the mind; and that the general abstract notion, which is at the same time to include all and none of the circumstances of individual existence, is a fiction which never can be realized. They would have arrived at a conclusion still more comprehensive and important, if they had drawn this farther consequence, that there is not in nature any Universal really existing; and that since no idea can be other than the idea of an individual, to terms alone can a universal or general nature be ascribed. From all which it must follow as a necessary result,—that without language neither can knowledge be acquired, nor reasoning exerted, by the human intellect; and that, since language must precede these, it cannot have been discovered by them, and therefore cannot be deemed the offspring of human invention.

[3] See Shuckf. *Connect.* vol. i. p. 109, and also an essay of Count de Fraula, (*Mém. de l' Acad. Imper. et Roy.* Brussels, vol. xiv.) in which language is represented as an instinctive quality of man, constituting a part of his very creation.

[4] Dr Blair in his *Lectures on Rhetoric*, (vol. i. p. 71,) makes the following just and apposite observations:—"One would think, that, in order to any language fixing and extending itself, men must have been previously gathered together in considerable numbers; society must have been already far advanced: and yet, on the other hand, there seems to have been an absolute necessity for speech, previous to the formation of society. For, by what bond could any multitude of men be kept together, or be made to join in the prosecution of any common interest, until once, by the intervention of speech, they could communicate their wants and intentions to each other? So that, either how society could form itself, previously to language, or how words could rise into a language, previously to society formed, seem to be points attended with equal difficulty. And when we consider, &c. difficulties increase so much upon us on all hands, that there seems to be no small reason for referring the first origin of all language to divine teaching or inspiration."

philosopher: but that sounds, either excited by passions, or produced by imitation, would necessarily be formed so as to constitute an inarticulate language; which would ultimately suggest the idea, and supply the elements, of more perfect speech. The transition, however, from the simple sound to the diversified articulation is still a wide chasm in each of these solutions. And whilst the range of the passions seems, on the one hand, to present a limit which the powers of communication, derived from that source, cannot be conceived to transcend; the various sounds and motions in nature must, on the other, be admitted to exhaust the models, which alone could draw forth the imitative powers of the human voice. So that, according to these theories, single tones, or cries, either excited by some passion, or formed in imitation of some natural sound, must in all just reasoning fill up the measure of human language. It is not easy, then, to discover any advantage possessed by these theories over that of Lord Monboddo, and the ancient Epicurean philosophers. The latter but represent the human kind originally placed in the condition of brutes; the former seem careful to provide that it should never rise above that condition.

As it may be matter of curiosity to know in what manner these writers endeavour to explain the transition from mere vocal sounds to articulate speech, it may be proper to subjoin here a specimen taken from one of them, by no means the least distinguished in the literary world, the Abbé De Condillac. He admits the operation to be extremely tedious; for that "the organ of speech (in grown persons,) for want of early use, would be so inflexible that it could not articulate any other than a few simple sounds: and the obstacles which prevented them from pronouncing others, would prevent them from suspecting that the voice was susceptible of any farther variation." Now it may be fairly asked, would not these obstacles for ever prevent any articulations, or even sounds, beyond those which the passions might excite, or other sounds suggest? How is this difficulty, which has been fairly admitted by the author, to be removed? He shall answer for himself. The child, from the pliancy of its vocal organs, being freed from the obstructions which incapacitated the parent, will accidentally fall upon new articulations in the endeavour to communicate its desire for a particular object; the parent will endeavour to imitate this sound, and affix it as a name to the object, for the purpose of communicating with the child: and thus, by repeated enlargements of articulation in successive generations, language would at length be produced.[5]

Such is the solution of the origin of language which human philosophy presents; sending us to the accidental babble of infancy for the origination of that, which, it confesses, must exceed the power of the imagination to invent, and of the organs of the man to accomplish: inverting the order of nature, by supposing the adult to learn the art of speech by imitation of the nursling; and, in addition to all, building upon the gratuitous assumption, that the child could utter articulations undirected by any pre-existing model. On such reasoning it cannot be necessary to enlarge.

Besides, to all those theories which maintain the human invention of language, the test of experience may fairly be applied. We may safely challenge their authors to produce in their support a single fact, a single instance, in the whole range of history, of any human creature ever using articulate sounds as the signs of ideas, unless taught, either immediately and at once by God, or gradually by those who had been themselves instructed. That there have been instances of persons, who, possessing all the natural powers of mind and body, yet remained destitute of speech from the want of an instructor, there can be no question. Diodorus Siculus (lib. iii. § 19, p. 187, tom. 1. Wessel.) informs us of an entire nation wanting the use of speech, and communicating only by signs and gestures. But, not to urge so extraordinary a fact, Lord Monboddo himself, in his first volume, furnishes several well attested instances; and relates particularly the case of a savage, who was caught in the woods of Hanover, and who, though by no means deficient either in his mental powers or bodily organs, was yet utterly incapable of speech. Had man then been left solely to the operation of his own natural powers, it is incumbent upon these writers to shew, that his condition would have differed as to speech from that of the Hanoverian savage.

---

[5] It should be remarked, that, were even all that is here contended for admitted to be practicable, language in the true sense of the word is not yet attained. The power of designating an individual object by an appropriate articulation, is a necessary step in the formation of language, but very far removed, indeed, from its consummation. Without the use of general signs, the speech of man would differ little from that of brutes; and the transition to the general term from the name of the individual is a difficulty which remains still to be surmounted. Condillac, indeed, proposes to shew how this transition may be made, in the natural course of things, "Un enfant appelle du nom *d' Arbre* le premier arbre que nous lui montrons. Un second arbre qu'il voit ensuite lui rappelle la même idée; il lui donne le même nom; de même à un troisième, à un quatrième, et voilà la mot *d' Arbre* donné d'abord à un individu, qui devient pour lui un nom de classe ou de genre, une idée abstraite qui comprend tous les arbres en général." In like manner Adam Smith, in his *Dissertation on the Origin of Languages*, and Mr Dugald Stewart, in his *Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, endeavour to explain this process; representing those words which were originally used as the proper names of individuals, to be successively transferred to other individuals, until, at length, each of them became insensibly the common name of a multitude. This, however, is more ingenious than solid. The name given to an individual being intended exclusively to designate that individual, it is a direct subversion of its very nature and design to apply it to any other individual, known to be different from the former. The child, it is true, may give the name of *father* to an individual like to the person it has been taught to call by that name: but this is from mistake, not from design; from a confusion of the two as the same person, and not from a perception of resemblance between them whilst known to be different. In truth, they whose thoughts are occupied solely about individual objects, must be the more careful to distinguish them from each other; and, accordingly, the child will most peremptorily retract the appellation of *father*, so soon as the distinctness is observed. The object with those, whose terms or signs refer only to individuals, must naturally be to take care that every such term or sign shall be applied to its appropriate individual, and to none else. Resemblance can produce no other effect than to enforce a greater caution in the application of the individual names, and therefore has no natural tendency to lead the mind to the use of general terms. It may be thought, indeed, that the idea of *number*, attaching to individuals of a similar appearance, might naturally lead to some general designation, whereby the aggregate of those individuals might be marked out. But it should be recollected, that the very notion of number, which seems one of the commonest and most familiar to the mind, does itself presuppose a class; since objects cannot be enumerated, unless previously referred to some one genus or class, or, which is the same thing, unless they are previously expressed by some common sign. Since, then, mere *resemblance* will not lead to the use of general terms; and since the notion of *number* actually presupposes the existence of general terms; it follows, that the transition from proper names to general terms cannot be accounted for in the way in which these writers have endeavoured to explain it.

As for those writers who admit the Mosaic account, and yet attribute to Adam the formation of language unassisted by divine instruction, they seem to entertain a notion more incomprehensible than the former; inasmuch as the first exercise of language by the father of mankind is stated to have preceded the production of Eve, and cannot, consistently with the Scripture account, be supposed to have been long subsequent to his own creation. So that, according to these theorists, he must have devised a medium of communication, before any human being existed with whom to communicate: he must have been able to apply an organ unexercised, and inflexible, to the arduous and delicate work of articulation; and he must at once have attained the use of words, without those multiplied preparatory experiments and concurring aids, which seem on all hands admitted to be indispensable to the discovery and production of speech.

To remedy some of these difficulties, it has been said, that the faculty of speech was made as natural to man as his reason, and that the use of language was the necessary result of his constitution. If by this were meant, that man spoke as necessarily as he breathed, the notion of an innate language must be allowed; and then the experiment of the Egyptian king to discover the primitive language of man, must be confessed to have had its foundation in nature: but if it be merely meant, that man was by nature invested with the powers of speech, and by his condition, his relations, and his wants, impelled to the exercise of these powers, the difficulty returns, and all the obstacles already enumerated oppose themselves to the discovery of those powers, and to the means by which he was enabled to bring them into actual exertion. It may perhaps add strength to the observations already made upon this subject, to remark, that the author who has maintained this last mentioned theory, and whose work, as containing the ablest and most laborious examination of the question, has been crowned with a prize by the Academy of Berlin, and has been honoured with the general applause of the continental literati, has utterly failed, and is admitted to have failed, in that which is the grand difficulty of the question. For, whilst he enlarges on the intelligent and social qualities of man, all fitting him for the use of language, the transition from that state which thus prepares man for language, to the actual exercise of the organs of speech, he is obliged to leave totally unexplained. (See the account given of the Essay of Herder on the origin of language, in *Nouveaux Mémoires de l'Acad. Roy. &c. de Berlin*, 1771—and again an Analysis of that work by M. Merian, in the vol. of the same *Mémoires* for the year 1781.) Enough, perhaps more than enough, has been said in answer to those theories and objections, which have been raised in opposition to that which Scripture[6] so obviously and unequivocally asserts, — namely, the divine institution of language.

---

[6] In addition to the proof which has been already derived from this source, it should be remembered, that the laws given by God to the first pair respecting food for their preservation (Gen. i. 29; ii. 9,) and marriage for the propagation of their species (Gen. ii. 22, 23,) together with the other discoveries of his will recorded in the beginning of Genesis, (i. 28; ii. 16—19; iii. 8—12, 14—22,) were communicated through the medium of language; and that the man and the woman are there expressly stated to have conversed with God, and with each other. Besides, in what sense could it be said that a meet companion for the man was formed, if there were not given to both the power of communicating their thoughts by appropriate speech? If God pronounced it "not good for man to be alone;" if, with multitudes of creatures surrounding him, he was still deemed to be *alone*, because there was none of these with which he could commune in rational correspondence; if a companion was assigned to him whose society was to rescue him from this solitude; what can be inferred, but that the indispensable requisite for such society, the powers and exercise of speech, must have been at the same time vouchsafed?

It should be recollected, too, that this is not the only instance recorded in Scripture of the instantaneous communication of language. The diversity of tongues occasioning the confusion of Babel, and the miraculous gift of speech to the apostles on the day of Pentecost, may render a similar exercise of divine power in the case of our first parents more readily admissible: for it surely will not be contended, that such supernatural interference was less called for from the nature of the occasion, in the last named instance, than in either of the two former.

The writer of Ecclesiasticus pronounces decisively on the subject of this Number. When the Lord created man, he affirms that, having bestowed upon him "the five operations of the Lord, in the sixth place he imparted to him understanding: and in the seventh, speech, an interpretation of the cogitations thereof."—Eccles. xvii. 5.

It is not necessary to the purpose of this
umber, nor does Scripture require us, to
uppose with Stillingfleet (*Orig. Sac.* B. i. cap.
§ 3.) and with Bochart (*Hieroz.* P. i. L. i.
ap. 9.) that Adam was endued with a full
nd perfect knowledge of the several creatures,
o as to impose names truly expressive of their
atures. It is sufficient, if we suppose the use
f language taught him with respect to such
hings as were necessary, and that he was
hen left to the exercise of his own faculties
or farther improvement upon this founda-
ion. But that the terms of worship and
doration were among those which were first
ommunicated, we can entertain little doubt.
n the subject discussed in this Number, the
eader may consult Morinus, *Exercit. de Ling.*
ap. vi.; Buxtorfii *Dissertat.* p. 1—20; Walton.
rol. 1 § 4; Warburt. *Div. Leg.* B. iv. S. iv.
ol. ii. pp. 81, 82; Delan. *Rev. Exam.* Diss. 4;
Vinder's *Hist. of Knowledge*, chap. i. § 2;
arrington's *Misc. Sacr.* vol. iii. pp. 8. 45;
r Beattie and Wollaston, as referred to; and,
bove all, Dr Ellis's *Enquiry whence cometh*
Visdom, &c. which, together with his work,
ntitled *Knowledge of Divine Things from*
evelation, is too little known, and cannot be
oo strongly recommended. The former of
hese tracts of Dr Ellis I have never met with,
ut as bound up in the collection of Tracts,
ntitled *The Scholar armed.*

No. LIV.—Page 18. Col. 1.

ON THE NATURAL UNREASONABLENESS OF THE SACRIFICIAL RITE.

Outram states (*De Sac.* lib. ii. cap. i. § 3.)
hat the force of this consideration was in
tself so great, as to compel Grotius, who
efended the notion of the human institution
f sacrifices, to maintain, in defiance of all
ust criticism, that Abel did not slay the
rstlings of his flock; and that no more is
neant, than that he brought the choicest
roduce of his flock, milk and wool, and
ffered them, as Cain offered the choicest of
is fruits.

Indeed the natural unfitness of the sacri-
icial rite to obtain the divine favour, the
otal incongruity between the killing of God's
reatures, and the receiving a pardon for the
iolation of God's law, are topics which have
fforded the opponents of the divine institu-
ion of sacrifice too much occasion for triumph,
o be controverted on their side of the question.
ee *Philemon to Hydaspes*, part 5. p. 10 — 15.
he words of Spencer on this subject are too
emarkable to be omitted: "Sacrificiorum
nateria (pecudum caro, sanguis effusus, &c.)
am vilis est, et a summâ Dei majestate tam
onge dissita, quod nemo (nisi plane simplex
t rerum rudis) quin sacrificia plane superflua, Deoque prorsus indigna facile judicaret. Sane tantum aberat, ut ethnici paulo humaniores sacrificia deorum suorum naturæ consentanea crederent, quod iis non rare mirari subiit, *unde ritus tam tristis, et a natura deorum alienus, in hominum corda veniret, se tam longe propagaret, et eorum moribus tam tenaciter adhæreret.*" *De Leg. Heb.* lib. iii. diss. ii. cap. 4. sect. 2. p. 772. — Revelation would have removed the wonder.

No. LV.—Page 18. Col. 1.

ON THE UNIVERSALITY OF SACRIFICE.

What Dr Kennicott has remarked upon another subject, may well be applied to this. "Whatever custom has prevailed over the world, among nations the most opposite in polity and customs in general: nations not united by commerce or communication, (when that custom has nothing in nature, or the reason of things, to give it birth, and to establish to itself such a currency,) must be derived from some revelation: which revelation may in certain places have been forgotten, though the custom introduced by and founded on such revelation still continued. And farther, this revelation must have been made antecedent to the dispersion of Babel, when all mankind, being but one nation, and living together in the form of one large family, were of one language, and governed by the same laws and customs." (*Two Dissert.* p. 161.) For, as Sir Isaac Newton observes, all mankind lived together in Chaldæa under the government of Noah and his sons, until the days of Peleg. So long they were of one language, one society, and one religion. And then they divided the earth, being forced to leave off building the tower of Babel. And from thence they spread themselves into the several countries which fell to their shares, carrying along with them the laws, customs, and religion, under which they had till those days been educated and governed. (*Chronol.* p. 186.)

And again, as Kennicott observes from Delaney, whatever practice has obtained universally in the world, must have obtained from some dictate of reason, or some demand of nature, or some principle of interest, or else from some powerful influence or injunction of some Being of universal authority. Now, the practice of animal sacrifice did not obtain from reason; for no reasonable notions of God could teach men, that he could delight in blood, or in the fat of slain beasts. Nor will any man say, that we have any natural instinct to gratify, in spilling the blood of an innocent creature. Nor could there be any temptation from appetite to do this in those ages, when the whole sacrifice was consumed by fire; or when, if it was not, yet men wholly abstained from flesh: and, consequently, this practice did not owe its origin to any principle of interest. Nay, so far from any thing of this, that the destruction of innocent and useful creatures is evidently against nature, against reason, and against interest; and therefore must be founded in an authority, whose influence was as powerful, as the practice was universal: and that could be none but the authority of God, the Sovereign of the world; or of Adam, the founder of the human race. If it be said of Adam, the question still remains, what motive determined him to the practice? It could not be nature, reason, or interest, as has been already shewn; it must, therefore, have been the authority of his Sovereign: and had Adam enjoined it to his posterity, it is not to be imagined, that they would have obeyed him in so extraordinary and expensive a rite, from any other motive than the command of God. If it be urged, that superstitions prevail unaccountably in the world; it may be answered, that all superstition has its origin in true religion: all superstition is an abuse: and all abuse supposes a right and proper use. And if this be the case in superstitious practices that are of lesser moment and extent, what shall be said of a practice existing through all ages, and pervading every nation? See Kennic. *Two Diss.* pp. 210, 211, and *Rev. Exam.* Diss. viii. p. 85 — 89.

It is to no purpose that theorists endeavour to explain the practice as of gradual growth; the first offerings being merely of fruits, and a transition afterwards made from this to animal sacrifice. Not to urge the sacrifice of Abel, and all the early sacrifices recorded in Scripture, the transition is itself inconceivable. The two things are *toto cœlo* different: the one being an act of innocence; the other a cruel and unnatural rite. Dr Richie's remarks on the subject of this Number are particularly worthy of attention. *Essay on the Rectitude of Divine Moral Government under the Patriarchal Dispensation*, § 53, 54.

No. LVI. — Page 18. Col. 1.

ON THE UNIVERSALITY OF THE NOTION OF THE EXPIATORY VIRTUE OF SACRIFICE.

It is notorious, as we have already seen in Nos. V. and XXXIII, that all nations, Jews and Heathens, before the time of Christ, entertained the notion, that the displeasure of the offended Deity was to be averted by the sacrifice of an animal; and that, to the shedding of its blood, they imputed their pardon[1] and reconciliation. In the explication of so strange a notion, and of the universality of its extent, unassisted reason must confess itself totally confounded. And, accordingly, we find Pythagoras, Plato, Porphyry, and other reflecting heathens, express their wonder, how[2] an institution so dismal, and big with absurdity, could have spread through the world.

So powerful is the inference, which this fact consequently supplies, against the human invention of sacrifice, that Dr Priestley, labouring to support that doctrine, and, at the same time, pressed by the force of the argument, has been obliged boldly to face about, and resolutely deny the fact; contending, in defiance, as we have already shewn, of all historical evidence, that the notion of expiating guilt by the death of the victim, was not the design of sacrifice, either among the nations of antiquity, or among such as have practised sacrifice in later times. This idea Dr Priestley considers too absurd for heathens. Christians alone, excepting that description who have proved themselves on this head as enlightened as heathens, could have swallowed such monstrous absurdities. If, however, the fact appears to be against Dr Priestley, what follows from his reasoning? A cruel, expensive, and unnatural practice has been adopted, and uniformly pursued, by the unaided reason of mankind for above four thousand years. It remains then for him, and the other advocates for the strength and sufficiency of human reason, to consider whether it be that sort of guide, on which implicit reliance is to be placed; and whether it be wise to intrust to its sole direction our everlasting concerns.

No. LVII. — Page 18. Col. 2.

ON THE OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE SUPPOSITION OF THE DIVINE INSITITUTION OF SACRIFICE.

The principal objections to this opinion are derived from the two following considerations: 1. The silence of the sacred historian on this head; which, in a matter of so great importance, it is said, is irreconcileable with the supposition of a divine command: 2. Those passages in the Old Testament, in which God seems openly to disown the institution of sacrifice.

I. The former is thus urged by Bishop Warburton. "The two capital observances, in the Jewish ritual, were the *Sabbath*, and *Sacrifices*. To impress the highest reverence and veneration on the sabbath, the sacred historian is careful to record its divine original: and can we suppose that, had sacrifices had the same original, he would have neglected to stablish this truth, at the time that he ecorded the other, since it is of equal use, and f equal importance ; I should have said, ndeed of much greater ?" (*Div. Leg.* B. ix. ch. i. vol. 4. pp. 661, 662. ed. Hurd.)

---

[1] See on this also Stanhope, Serm. xiii. *Boyle Lect.* vol. i. pp. 790, 794.

[2] See Kennic. *Two Dissert.* p. 202, and No. LIV. of this work.

To this it may be answered, that though he distinction of weeks was well known over ll the eastern world, it is highly probable, hat the Hebrews, during their residence in Egypt, were negligent in their observance of he sabbath ; and that, to enforce a religious bservance of it, it had become necessary to ive them particular information of the time nd occasion of its first institution ; but that, n a country like Egypt, the people being in ittle danger of losing their veneration for acrifices, the same necessity for directing heir attention explicitly to their institution id not exist. The observation of Dr Delaney lso deserves to be noticed ; namely, that as he rite of sacrifice was loaded with many dditional ceremonies, at its second institution, nder Moses ; in order to guard the Jews from he infections of the heathen, it might have een wisely designed by their lawgiver not to ecall their attention to its original simplicity, est they should be tempted to murmur and ebel against their own multifarious ritual. *Rev. Exam.* Diss. viii. vol. i. p. 94.

But, perhaps, an answer yet more satisfacory may be derived from considering the nanner in which the history of the first ages f the world has been sketched by the sacred enman. The rapid view he takes of the ntediluvian world, (having devoted but a ew chapters to the important and interesting oncerns of the Creation, the Fall, and the ransactions of all those years that preceded he Flood,) necessarily precluded a circumtantial detail. Accordingly, we find several natters of no small moment connected with hat early period, and also with the ages imnediately succeeding, entirely omitted, which re related by other sacred writers. Thus Peter and Jude inform us of the angels that ell from their first estate, and are reserved in verlasting chains ; also of a prophecy delivered y Enoch to those of his days ; of the preachng of righteousness by Noah ; and of the vexation which the righteous soul of Lot daily xperienced, from the unlawful deeds of those with whom he lived, (2 Pet. ii. 4, 5, 7, 8, and Jude, 6, 14, 15.) None of these things are nentioned by Moses : and even such matters s he has deemed of sufficient consequence to notice, he introduces only as they may be onnected with the direct historic line which he holds in view ; and, whilst hastening on o those nearer events on which it was necesary for him to enlarge, he touches on other ffairs, however important, but as they incilentally arise. In this way, the first mention f sacrifice is evidently introduced ; not for he purpose of giving a formal history of the rite, of explaining how or when it was instituted, in which case a formal account of its origin might have been expected ; but merely as an occasional relation, in the history of the transfer of the seniority, or right of primogeniture, and so the parentage of the Messiah, from Cain into a younger line, which, according to Kennicott, was a thing absolutely necessary to be known ; and also, probably, of the ruinous effects of the Fall, in the effervescence of that wicked and malicious spirit, which made its first baleful display in the murder of Abel. The silence, then, of the historian, as to the divine institution of sacrifice, furnishes no argument against it. See Kenn. *Two Diss.* p. 211 ; Wits. *Misc. Sac.* Lib. ii. Diss. ii. § 2 ; also Richie's *Pecul. Doct.* vol. i. p. 136.

But then, according to the Bishop's reasoning, the relation given by Moses of the institution of the sabbath justifies the expectation, that, had sacrifice arisen from the divine command, its origin would likewise have been recorded. But in what way is the divine appointment of the sabbath recorded? Is it any where asserted by Moses, that God had ordered Adam and his posterity to dedicate every seventh day to holy uses, and to the worship of his name ; or that they ever did so, in observance of any such command? No such thing. It is merely said, that, having rested from the work of creation, " God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." Now, so far is this passage from being universally admitted to imply a command for the sacred observance of the sabbath, that some have altogether denied the sabbath to have been instituted by divine appointment : and the fathers in general, and especially Justin Martyr, have been considered as totally rejecting the notion of a patriarchal sabbath. But although, especially after the very able and learned investigation of this subject by Dr Kennicott in the second of his *Two Dissertations*, no doubt can reasonably be entertained of the import of this passage, as relating the divine institution of the sabbath, yet still the rapidity of the historian has left this rather as matter of inference : and it is certain, that he has nowhere made express mention of the observance of a sabbath until the time of Moses.

Indeed, it may be a question, whether, considering accurately the passage which describes the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, and the circumstances attending them, it does not in itself furnish sufficiently strong ground to infer the divine appointment of sacrifice. The familiar manner in which the mention of this sacrifice is introduced, joined to the peculiar force of the words מקץ ימים, (which, as Kennicott, supported by Fagius, shews, ought not to be translated, generally, *in process of time*, but *at the close of the appointed season,*) seems to indicate a prior and stated observance of this rite; and the manifest acceptance of Abel's sacrifice by God evinces an approbation of that pre-existing practice, which can leave little doubt respecting the source of its institution. And this advantage the case of sacrifice clearly possesses over that of the sabbath; namely, that in the patriarchal history we have repeated and explicit accounts of the continuance of the former, whilst the notices of the sabbatical observance, antecedent to the Mosaic dispensation, are obscure and infrequent. Now, were we to argue rigidly against the continued observance of the sabbath, from its not having been expressly recorded, we might contend, as has been already hinted, for the necessity of a more explicit statement of its divine origin in the time of Moses; whilst the unbroken tradition and uninterrupted practice of sacrifice, (a thing controverted by none that I know of, except Lord Barrington in his *Miscellanea Sacra,* vol. iii. Diss. ii. cor. 3. and by him upon grounds rather fanciful and refined,) might render it less necessary for Moses to be particular on this head.

But, in truth, the silence of the historian respecting either the sabbatical or sacrificial observance is but of little weight, when there are circumstances in the history, from which the practice may be collected. The very notoriety of a custom may be a reason, why the historian may omit the mention of its continuance. Of this Dr Kennicott states a striking exemplification in the case of circumcision, which though constantly observed by the Israelites, is yet never once mentioned in the sacred history as having been practised in a single instance, from the settling of the Israelites in Canaan, down to the circumcision of our blessed Saviour; that is, for a space of one thousand four hundred and fifty years. And even of the observance of the sabbath itself, we find not one instance recorded, in any of the six books that follow the Mosaic code. What is thus applied to the continuance, will equally hold for the origin of a custom.

II. The second objection, derived from passages in the Old Testament in which God seems to disown the institution of sacrifice, is to be replied to by an examination of those passages. In the fiftieth Psalm God is described as saying, "I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices, or thy burnt-offerings — I will take no bullock," &c. — "Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?" And again in Psal. li. "Thou desirest not sacrifice — thou delightest not in burnt-offerings." And again in Psal. xl. "Burnt-offerings and sin-offerings hast thou not required." Sacrifices here, it is said, are spoken of as not pleasing to God. But it is manifest, on an inspection of the context, that this is only intended in a comparative sense, and as abstracting from those concomitants, without which sacrifice never could have been acceptable to a holy and righteous God. This is farther confirmed by the manner in which similar declarations are introduced, in Isa. i. 11, 12; lxvi. 3; Prov. xv. 8; and Amos, v. 21, 22. If the argument be carried farther, it will prove too much; it will prove, in direct contradiction to the testimony of Moses, that the Jewish sacrifices had not been ordained by God. These passages, then, from the Psalms must go for nothing in the present argument.

But, then, it is said that the prophet Jeremiah (vii. 22,) furnishes a decisive proof in these words, — "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices." This, it is urged, as referring expressly to a time prior to the giving of the law at Mount Sinai, clearly proves that God did not institute sacrifices before the promulgation of the law by Moses. But this, like the former passages, is manifestly to be understood in a comparative sense only; as may easily be collected from what immediately follows: "But this thing I commanded them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people;" that is, "The mere sacrifice was not that which I commanded, so much as that which was to give to the sacrifice its true virtue and efficacy, a sincere and pious submission to my will;" "to obey being *better than* sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams," (1 Sam. xv. 22.) In like manner, — "I will have mercy, and *not* sacrifice," (Hos. vi. 6.) "Rend your hearts, and *not* your garments," (Joel, ii. 13.) "Your murmurings are *not* against us, but against the Lord," (Ex. xvi. 8.) "Labour *not* for the meat that perisheth, but for the meat which endureth to everlasting life," (John, vi. 27.) The Scripture abounds with similar instances, in which the negative form supplies the want of the comparative degree in the Hebrew idiom: not excluding the thing denied, but only implying a preference of the thing set in opposition to it.[1]

Dr Blayney, indeed, thinks it not necessary to consider the words of Jeremiah in a comparative sense. The word על, he says, admitting the sense of *propter*, the passage should be read, "I spake not with your fathers, nor commanded them, *for the sake of* burnt-offerings," &c.; that is, God did not command these purely on their own account, but as a means to some other valuable end. The sense is substantially the same. Now, if the passage be not taken in this sense, but be supposed to imply, that God had not instituted sacrifices at the time of the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt, then a direct contradiction is given to the Mosaic history, which expressly declares, that God himself had ordained the slaying of the paschal lamb, not only before the giving of the law at Sinai, but before the migration of the Israelites from Egypt. And that this was really a sacrifice, and is repeatedly called by Moses by the very same term זבח, which is here applied to denote sacrifice by the prophet, has been already fully shewn in No. XXXV. of this work.

---

[1] See Walt. *Polyglot.* Proleg. Idiotism. 6. Lowth on Hos. vi. 6. Mede, p. 352. Kenn. *Two Diss.* pp. 208, 209; and Jenn. *Jew. Ant.* vol. i. p. 313.

Or, again, if we concur in the interpretation of this passage, as given by the Jewish doctors, Jarchi and Maimonides, and adopted by Dr Kennicott, we may consider it as a declaration on the part of God, that he had not first commanded the Israelites concerning the sacrificial rites, after he had led them out of Egypt. The passage in Jeremiah, say they, refers to the transaction at Marah, (see particularly Kenn. *Two Diss.* pp. 153, 209.) The Jews, when they had arrived here, three days after they had left the Red Sea, murmured at the bitterness of the waters: a miracle was wrought to sweeten them; and then God made a statute and ordinance for them, and proposed to them, in exact agreement with what is here said in Jeremiah, to obey him, to give ear to his commandments, and keep his statutes, and that he would in turn be their protector, (Exod. xv. 25, 26.) Now, this having been some time before the formal institution of the sacrificial rite at Mount Sinai, and the Jews having always dated the beginning of the law from this declaration at Marah, the Jewish doctors maintain it to be true in fact, that God did not first enjoin their code of sacrificial observances, but commanded them concerning moral obedience: and thus they understand the form of expression in Jeremiah, as we do that of Saint Paul, "Adam was *not* deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression," (1 Tim. ii. 14;) that is, Adam was not first deceived, and was not first in the transgression, but Eve. The meaning of the passage in Jeremiah would then be, that as God had not, in the first instance, enjoined to the Jews their sacrificial ritual, after he had led them out of Egypt; so they were not to attach to the observance of all its *minutiæ* a superiority over moral obedience, but the contrary, the latter having been first commanded.[2] This explanation agrees in substance with the former: and from both it manifestly appears, that this passage has no relation to the original institution of animal sacrifice.

The whole of this subject is fully and ably treated by Mede, who sums up his entire argument in these words. "According to one of these three senses, are all passages in the Old Testament disparaging and rejecting sacrifices literally to be understood: namely, when men preferred them before the greater things of the Law; valued them out of their degree, as an antecedent duty; or placed their efficacy in the naked right, as if aught accrued to God thereby; God would no longer own them for any ordinance of his; nor, indeed, in that disguise put upon them, were they." Mede's *Works*, pp. 352, 353.

No. LVIII. — Page 18. Col. 2.

ON THE SACRIFICE OF ABEL, AS EVINCING THE DIVINE INSTITUTION OF SACRIFICE.

Hallet considers this single fact as supplying so strong an argument on the present question, that he does not hesitate to pronounce it, a demonstration of a divine institution. "For," he says, "Abel's sacrifice could not have been acceptable, if it had not been of divine appointment, according to that obvious maxim of all true religion, 'In vain do they worship God, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men,' (Mark, vii. 7.) Thus, Abel must have worshipped God in vain, had his sacrificing been merely a commandment of his father Adam, or an invention of his own. And, to make this matter more evident, why do we not now offer up a bullock, a sheep, or a pigeon, as a thank-offering after any remarkable deliverance, or as an evidence of our apprehensions of the demerit of sin? The true reason is, because we cannot know that God will accept such will-worship, and so conclude that we should herein worship God in vain. As Abel, then, did not sacrifice in vain, it was not will-worship, but a divine appointment. To this, the want of a right to slay animals before the Flood, unless conferred by God for this very purpose of sacrifice, gives yet farther confirmation." Hallet on Hebr. xi. 4.

Dr Richie remarks, that the divine acceptance is not confined to the sacrifice of Abel, but that we find it extended also to others offered under the patriarchal dispensation. Thus, God is said to have "smelled a sweet savour" (a strong expression of his acceptance) when Noah offered his burnt-offering. Job's care, likewise, to offer burnt-offerings for his children, is mentioned as an eminent effect of piety, and with particular marks of approbation, (Job, i.) And the honourable mention, which is made of the sacrifices offered by other pious men in this period of the world, leaves no room to doubt of their having been likewise graciously accepted by God. It is, moreover, to be observed, that the oblation of some of those early sacrifices was expressly ordered by God himself; as the burnt-offering of Abraham (Gen. xxii.) and those which were offered by the three friends of Job, (xlii.) Now, that it is more natural to think, that God would order and accept of the performance of a mode of worship which had been instituted by himself, than that he would thus countenance one which had been the product of mere human invention, is a thing which will not bear much dispute. See Dr Richie's *Pec. Doct.* vol. i. pp. 149, 150. Indeed, whoever wishes to see the subject of the divine institution of sacrifices satisfactorily treated, may consult the last named work, p. 136—151, to great advantage. See also Barrington's *Misc. Sac.* vol. iii. pp. 67—71; and Heideg. *Hist. Patr. Exercit.* iii. § 52, 53, tom. i.

---

[2] See Maim. *Morch. Nev.* part. iii. cap. 32, ap. fin.—Kennicott's *Two Diss.* pp. 153, 209.—and Jenn. *Jew. Ant.* vol. i. p. 312.

This last mentioned writer considers the ἐμπυρισμὸς, or the burning of the sacrifice by fire from heaven, a decisive proof of a divine institution: and that the patriarchs were favoured with this infallible sign of the divine acceptance of their sacrifices, the language of Scripture leaves us no room to doubt. That it was by this sign that it was known that the sacrifice of Abel was accepted, is the almost unanimous opinion of the fathers. And in this the Jewish doctors concur: as see Aben Ezra and Jarchi on Gen. iv. 4. Theodotion translates the verb in this verse, ἐνεπύρισεν: a translation with which even Julian was satisfied.

It is certain that this manifestation of the divine power was vouchsafed in later times. The sacrifice of Abraham, (Gen. xv. 17,) supplies a striking instance of it. And if Shuckford's reading of בער (to kindle) instead of עבר (to pass) be admitted, this passage becomes in itself decisive of the point, (*Connection*, &c. vol. i. p. 298.) But if we look to the period under the law, we shall find this the usual method[1] of signifying the divine acceptance of the sacrifice. Hence, to accept a burnt sacrifice, is called in the Hebrew, (Ps. xx. 3,) to "turn it into ashes." The relics of this are to be found even in the heathen traditions. Thus Servius on Æn. xii. 200, says, "Amongst the ancients fire was not lighted upon the altar, but by prayer they called down fire from heaven, which consumed the offering." From these, and other arguments not less forcible, every commentator of note had been led to pronounce in favour of the idea, that the acceptance of the sacrifice was testified, from the beginning, in the miraculous manner here described.[2] That the fire which consumed the sacrifice was a flame which issued from the Shechinah, or glorious visible presence of God, is the opinion of Lord Barrington: see *Miscell. Sacr.* vol. iii. dissert. 2, "On God's visible presence." But be this as it may, the fact of this divine fire consuming the sacrifice seems to be established; and the inference from this fact in favour of the divine institution of sacrifice cannot easily be overturned.

No. LIX. — Page 18. Col. 2.

ON THE HISTORY AND THE BOOK OF JOB.

There is no one part of the sacred volume which has more exercised the ingenuity of the learned, than the Book of Job. Whether it contain a true history or a fabulous relation? If true, at what time and place Job lived? And what the date and author to be assigned to the work? — These are questions, which have given birth to opinions so various, and to controversies so involved, that to enumerate all, and to weigh their several merits, would far exceed the compass of the present work. But to take a brief review of the opinions of the most distinguished critics, and to elicit from contending arguments the probable result, whilst necessary to the subject of our present inquiry, cannot fail to furnish matter of interesting investigation.

I. On the first of the questions above stated, there have been three opinions: one, pronouncing the poem to be a real narrative: a second, holding it to be a mere fictitious relation, intended to instruct through the medium of parable: and the third, adopting an intermediate idea, and maintaining the work itself to be dramatic and allegorical, but founded upon the history of real characters and events.

Among the many distinguished names which support the first opinion, are to be reckoned, in later times, those of Spanheim, Sherlock, Schultens, Bishop Lowth, Peters, and Kennicott: to these, perhaps, may be added that of Grotius, who, though he contends that the work is a poetic representation, yet admits the subject to be matter of true history. In defence of this opinion, the work is considered as supplying strong intrinsic evidence; the general style and manner of the writer betraying nothing allegorical, but every where bespeaking a literal relation of actual events; entering into circumstantial details of habitation, kindred, and names; and adhering with undeviating exactness to those manners and usages, which belong to the age and country of which it seems to treat. The reality of the person of Job is also attested by the prophet Ezekiel, who ranks him with two other real and illustrious characters; and by the apostle James, who proposes him as a character particularly deserving of imitation. Concurrent traces of profane history, too, supply additional confirmation, as may be seen in Dr Gray's account of the Book of Job; so that, as this judicious writer properly observes, "it has every external sanction of authority, and is stamped with every intrinsic mark that can characterize a genuine relation."

---

[1] See Lev. ix. 24; Judg. vi. 21; 1 Kings, xviii. 38; 1 Chr. xxi. 26; 2 Chr. vii. 1, &c.

[2] See Fagius, Frotius, Le Clerc, Ainsw. Patrick, Jameson, Dathe, Rosenmüller, &c. on Gen. iv. 4.

In direct opposition to this is the system of Maimonides; which, representing the whole as a parabolical and fictitious relation, has been adopted, successively, by Le Clerc and Michaelis. The arguments of the first of these writers have been fully replied to by Codurcus; those of the second, by Peters; and those of the last have received some judicious animadversions from the pens of Dr Gray and Dr Gregory. The arguments commonly urged in support of this hypothesis are derived from certain circumstances of intrinsic improbability: such as, the miraculous rapidity with which the calamities of Job succeeded; the escape of precisely one servant to bear the news of each disaster; the destruction of seven thousand sheep, at once struck dead by lightning; the seven days' silence of the friends of Job; the highly figurative and poetic style of dialogue, which never could have taken place in actual conversation. These are what Peters calls the *little exceptions* of Le Clerc to the truth of the history; and might, some of them, deserve attention, were we neither to admit a supernatural agency in the transactions, nor a poetic rapidity in the narrative rejecting the consideration of unimportant particulars.

An objection, however, of greater moment is derived from the conversation of Satan with the Almighty: and to this Michaelis adds others which he claims as his peculiar invention, deduced from the name of Job; from the artificial regularity of the numbers; and from internal inconsistencies and contradictions. Of these last named, perhaps, the two former might well be ranked among the *little exceptions:* the derivation of the name of Job, from a word which signifies repentance, being at best but conjectural; and, even were it certain, making nothing against the reality of the persons; names having been frequently given in ancient times, from circumstances, which occurred at an advanced period of life; of which numerous instances appear in holy writ: and, as to the regularity of the numbers, —the years of Job's life, his children, his sheep, his camels, his oxen, and his asses, being all told in round numbers, and all exactly doubled in the years of his prosperity —it is obvious to remark, that it would ill suit the fulness and elegance of poetic[1] narration to descend to the minutiæ of exact numeration; and that, as to the precise duplication, it is but a periphrasis growing out of the former enumeration, intended merely to express, that the Lord gave to Job twice as much as he had before.

The two remaining objections require more particular consideration. And first, as to the incredibility of the conversation, which is related to have taken place between the Almighty and Satan, it may be observed, that this, and the assemblage of the celestial intelligences before the throne of God, should be considered as poetical, or, as Peters with more propriety expresses it, prophetical personifications, in accommodation to our limited faculties, which are abundantly authorized by God himself in holy Scripture, and are perfectly agreeable to the style wherein his prophets have been frequently commanded to deliver the most solemn and important truths. Thus, the prophetic visions of Isaiah, (chap. vi.) of Ezek. (chap. i.) of Saint Paul (2 Cor. xii. 2, 4,) and of Saint John, (Rev. iv. 1, 2,) represent the proceedings of Providence, in like reference to our powers and modes of conception: and the vision of Micaiah (1 Kings, xxii. 19—23,) and that of Zechariah (ii. 13. iii. 1,) supply cases precisely parallel in every respect. Farmer justly remarks on this subject, that such "visions, or parabolical representations, convey instruction as truly and properly, as if they were exact copies of outward objects."[2] And, indeed, if the introduction of Satan be admitted as an argument against the truth of the history, it should lead us equally to reject the narrative of our Lord's temptation, as an unfounded fiction. If, however, the opinion of Dathe (which has also the support of Herder, Eichhorn, and Doederlein,) be well founded, all difficulty arising even from this circumstance is removed; inasmuch as *the evil spirit* is not, according to his interpretation, intended; but one of the angelic ministers, whose peculiar office it was to explore and try the real characters of men, and to distinguish the hypocrite from the sincerely pious.

The objection, derived from the internal inconsistencies and contradictions of the work, is thus stated by Michaelis.—Job, who could not have been advanced in years himself, upbraids his friends with their youth (xxx. i.) yet these very men exact reverence from Job as their junior, speaking of themselves as aged men, much older than his father (xv. 10; and are expressly described by Elihu (xxxii. 6, 7,) as men to be respected for their hoary age. (*Notæ et Epimetra*, pp. 178, 179.) This argument Michaelis admits to be the grand strength of his cause, and to this Dr Gregory's reply is satisfactory, so far as the meaning of the passage (xxx. 1) is concerned; in which there certainly appears no relation to the friends of Job, but merely a general complaint bewailing the degraded state to which himself had fallen; and contrasting with that high respect which he had in former days experienced, — when even the aged arose and stood up, when princes refrained talking, and the nobles held their peace, — his present abject condition, when even those that were younger than him, and who were of such mean descent, that he would have disdained to have set their fathers with the dogs of his flock (by which he could not possibly have intended his three friends,) now held him in derision. But, I apprehend, Dr Gregory's criticism on ch. xv. 10. — namely, that by the words, *with us*, (בנו,) is meant, *with us in opinion* — is not at all supported by the genius of the Hebrew, nor by parallel usage. I think it is evident, both from this and the passage, xxxii. 6, 7, that the friends of Job, or some of them, were aged. But in the true meaning of the word ישיש, which seems to have been hit off by Chappelow alone of all the commentators, we shall find a complete solution of the difficulty. This word, as Chappelow remarks, on Job, xii. 12, and xxxii. 6, does not merely imply *age*, but the *wisdom* which should accompany age. It may, perhaps, not improperly be expressed, in our language, by the single term *sage*. Taking the word in this sense, no inconsistency whatever appears: for then the thing denied by Job to his friends, in xii. 12, claimed by themselves in xv. 10, and ascribed to them by Elihu, in xxxii. 6, 7, will be, not length of years, but those fruits of wisdom, which years should have produced. It should also be noted, that in xv. 10, the words are in the singular number; so that, in strictness, no more than one amongst them is here spoken of, as advanced in age beyond the years of Job. Indeed, an inconsistency so gross and obvious, as this which is charged against the Book of Job by the German professor, cannot be other than seeming, and founded in some misapprehension of the meaning of the original. Even admitting the poem to be fabulous, he must have been a clumsy contriver, who could in one place describe his characters as young, and in another as extremely aged, when urged to it by no necessity whatever, and at full liberty to frame his narrative as he pleased. And this want of comprehension should least of all have been objected by those critics, who, in supposing the work to have been composed in an age and country different from those whose manners it professes to describe, are compelled, upon their own hypothesis, to ascribe to the writer an uncommon portion of address and refinement.

---

[1] The poem, perhaps, strictly speaking, may be said not to begin until the third chapter; that which precedes being narration. But the narration, agreeably to the lofty style of the East, is itself of poetical elevation.

[2] *Enquiry into the Temptation*, p. 164.—attend to this writer's observations,—also to Chappel. *Comment. præf.* p. xiv. and particularly to Peters's *Crit. Diss.* p. 113—122, and Taylor's *Scheme of Scr. Div.* ch. xxi.

But, supposing the narrative to have a foundation in truth, the third hypothesis, which represents this as wrought up into an allegorical drama, remains to be considered. This strange conceit was the invention of Warburton. He considers Job, his wife, and his three friends, as designed to personate the Jewish people on their return from the captivity, their idolatrous wives, and the three great enemies of the Jews at that period, Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem. This allegorical scheme has been followed by Garnet, with some variations, whereby the history of Job is ingeniously strained to a description of the Jewish sufferings during the captivity. The whole of Warburton's system, the "improbabilities of which," as Peters observes, "are by no means glossed over by the elaborate reasoning and extravagant assertions of the learned writer," is fully examined and refuted by that ingenious author, in the first eight sections of his *Critical Dissertation*.

The arguments by which this extraordinary hypothesis has been supported, are drawn from the highly poetic and figurative style of the work, whence it is inferred to be *dramatic*; and from the unsuitableness of particular actions and expressions to the real characters, which at the same time correspond to the persons whom these characters are supposed to represent, whence it is inferred to be *allegorical*. But, from the first nothing more can fairly be deduced, than that the writer has not given the precise words of the speakers, but has dressed out the dialogue with the ornaments of poetry, in a manner which, as Dathe truly tells us, is agreeable to the customs of the country in which the scene is laid; it being usual to represent the conferences of their wise men on philosophic questions, in the most elevated strain of poetic diction. (See Dathe on Job, ch. iii.) And as to the second, it cannot appear to a sober reader in any other light than that of a wild and arbitrary fancy. Bishop Lowth declares, that he has not been able to discover a single vestige of an allegorical meaning, throughout the entire poem. It requires but a sound understanding to be satisfied, that it has no such aspect. And, at all events, this strange hypothesis rests altogether upon another; namely, that the book was written in the age of those, to whom it is supposed to bear this allegorical application. If, then, as we shall hereafter see, there be no just ground for assigning to the work so late a date, the whole of this airy fabric vanishes at once.

II. The history of Job appearing now, on the whole, to be a true relation, the second question comes to be considered, — In what age, and country, did he live? As to the place of Job's residence there seems to be little difficulty. Commentators are mostly agreed in fixing on Idumæa, a part of Arabia Petræa. Kennicott (*Remarks on Select Passages*, p. 152,) considers Bishop Lowth as having completely proved this point. Codurcus had long before maintained the same opinion, (*Præf. ad Job*;) and Dathe and the modern German commentators give it their support. The position of the land of Uz (see Lam. iv. 21) the residence of Job, and of the several places named as the habitations of his friends, seems to ascertain the point with sufficient precision. Children of the East, also, appears to be a denomination applicable to the inhabitants of that region (see Lowth, *Prælect.* xxxii.) and is even pronounced by Dathe to have been appropriate.

The only objection deserving notice, that can be raised against this supposition, is drawn from the great distance of Idumæa from the country of the Chaldeans, who, living on the borders of the Euphrates, could not easily have made depredations on the camels of Job. And this has been thought by some a sufficient cause for assigning to Job a situation in Arabia Deserta, and not far from the Euphrates. But, as Lowth replies, what should prevent the Chaldeans, as well as the Sabeans, a people addicted to rapine, and roving about at immense distances for the sake of plunder, from wandering through those defenceless regions, and pervading from Euphrates even to Egypt? And, on the other hand, what probability is there, that all the friends of Job, residing in and near Idumæa, should be instantly informed of all that had happened to Job in the desert of Arabia, and on the confines of Chaldea, and repair thither immediately after the transaction? Shuckford's arguments concur with these of Lowth, and are fully satisfactory on this head. See *Connect.* B. vii. vol. ii. p. 138. See also Gray on the book of Job, note r.[1] The LXX likewise describe the land of Uz as situated in Idumæa: and Job himself they consider an Idumæan, and a descendant of Esau, (see Append. of the LXX.) The Mohammedan writers likewise inform us that he was of the race of Esau. See Sale's *Koran*, chap. 21, vol. ii. p. 162.

With respect to the age of Job, one thing seems generally admitted; namely, its remote antiquity. Even they who contend for the late production of the Book of Job are compelled to acquiesce in this. Grotius thinks the events of the history are such, as cannot be placed later than the sojourning of the Israelites in the wilderness. *Præf ad Job.* Warburton, in like manner, admits them to bear the marks of high antiquity: and Michaelis confesses the manners represented to be perfectly Abrahamic, such as were common to all the seed of Abraham, Israelites, Ishmaelites, and Idumæans. (*Not. et Epim.* p. 181.)

Some of the principal circumstances from which the age of Job may be collected are these which follow:—1. The general air of antiquity which is spread over the manners recorded in the poem, of which Michaelis, as above referred to, has given striking instances. 2. The length of Job's life, which seems to place him in the patriarchal times. 3. The allusions made by Job to that species of idolatry alone, which by general confession was the most ancient, and which, as Lowth observes (*Lectures on Sacred Poetry*, Greg. ed. vol. ii. p. 355,) is a decisive mark of the patriarchal age. 4. The nature of the sacrifice offered by him in conformity to the divine command; namely, seven oxen and seven rams, similar to that of Balaam, and suitable to the respect entertained for the number seven in the earliest ages.[3] This, though, as Mr Henley observes, the ancient practice might have been continued in Idumæa after the promulgation of the Mosaic[4] law, is far from being, as he asserts, destitute of weight; inasmuch as the sacrifice was offered by the command of God, who, although he might be supposed graciously to accommodate himself to the prevailing customs before the promulgation of the Law, yet cannot be imagined, after he had prescribed a certain mode of sacrifice to the Israelites, to sanction by his express authority, in a country immediately adjoining, a mode entirely different, and one which the Mosaic code was intended to supersede. 5. The language of Job and his friends, who, being all Idumæans, or at least Arabians of the adjacent country, yet converse in Hebrew. This carries us up to an age so early as that in which all the posterity of Abraham, Israelites, Idumæans, and Arabians, yet continued to speak one common language, and had not branched into different dialects.[5] 6. Certain customs of the most remote antiquity are alluded to by Job. He speaks of the most ancient kind of writing, by sculpture. His riches also are reckoned by his cattle. And as to the word קשיטה, which is translated a *piece of money*, there seems good reason to understand it as signifying a *lamb*.

This word occurs but in two other parts of Scripture, Gen. xxxiii. 19, and Josh. xxiv. 32, and in both of these it is applied to the purchase of a piece of ground by Jacob, who is on that particular occasion represented as rich in flocks, and as driving with him large quantities of cattle: and, accordingly, the Targum of Onkelos, the LXX, Jerome, Pagninus, and the learned Jew Aben Ezra, have all of them rendered the word *lamb*, or *sheep*. In order to force the word to the signification of a piece of money, it has been pretended, that the coin bore the impress of a lamb. Upon this conjecture, and a passage in Acts vii. 15, 16, which can give it no support, is the entire interpretation built.[6] Now the notion of a stamped coin, as Dathe remarks, (on Job, xlii. 11,) is inadmissible in an age so early as that of Jacob. The way of payment in silver in the time of Abraham we know to have been by weight, or shekels uncoined: and what authority have we to pronounce, that stamped money was in use in the time of Jacob? The money which was put into the sacks of Joseph's brethren seems to have been the same as in the time of Abraham, being called צררות כספ, strictly *bundles of silver* (Gen. xlii. 35;) an expression not likely to be applied to coined pieces of money. And, indeed, no expression, indicating such pieces of money, seems to occur in any of the early books of the Bible. Junius and Tremellius on Gen. xxxiii. 19,[7] speak of sheep as the ancient medium of traffic; and pronounce the word קשיטה to be peculiar to the Arabians and ancient Canaanites. This, and the remark of Codurcus, "that as *pecunia* was first called from *pecus*, so *Keschita*, which first signified *pecus*, was afterwards transferred to signify *pecunia*," tend to confirm our reasoning. For if a sheep was the most ancient medium of traffic, and was in the earliest times expressed by the word *Keschita*, whilst its subsequent transfer to denote *pecunia* is but conjectural, there can be but little difficulty as to the conclusion. See also an elaborate dissertation on the word by Costard: in which he shews, that the first stamping of money with any effigies was of a date several centuries later than the time of Jacob, not having been known before the time of Cyrus. (*Enquiry into the Meaning of the Word Kesitah*, p. 12, &c.) If this opinion be right, the point is decided. At all events it should be remembered, that, if *Keschita* must signify a piece of money, the only age, beside that of Job, in which we find the word applied in Scripture, is the age of Jacob. That no such coin was known of under the Mosaic dispensation, is shewn by Hodges, in his *Elihu*, p. 242. I have dwelt thus long upon the investigation of the true meaning of this word, as well because the interpretation of it, as a stamped piece of money, seems to have been too easily acquiesced in by commentators in general; as because I would not presume to differ from the received translation without the most careful examination.

---

[3] See Jablonski *Panth. Ægypt. Proleg.* pp. 53—59. *Univ. Hist.* B. iii. ch. xxxvii. sect. 3; also Ains. on Lev. iv. 6; and Numb. xxxiii. 1.

[4] See Mr Henley's note in Dr Gregory's Translation of *Lowth's Lectures*, vol. ii. p. 356.

[5] See Lowth, *de Sacr. Poes. Præl.* xxxii. p. 311; also Gray on Job, note a[3].

[6] See Cocc. *Lex.*—Calas. *Concord.*—Drusius, and Grotius, and Hodge's *Elihu* on Job, xlii. 11; also Hamm. and Whitby on Acts, vii. 15, 16.

From the above considerations, the great antiquity of Job seems to be an unavoidable consequence. To specify the exact time at which he lived, is a matter of greater difficulty, but of inferior importance. Eusebius places him before Moses two whole ages: and in this he concurs with the opinion of many of the Hebrew writers, who (as Selden observes) describe him as living in the days of Isaac and Jacob. That the judgment of the eastern nations does not differ much from this, may be seen in Hottinger's *Smegma Orientale*, p. 381. (See Patrick's *Pref. to Job.*) Shuckford is of opinion that he was contemporary with Isaac. (*Connect.* B. vii. vol. ii. p. 127.) Spanheim (*Hist. Job*, cap. ix. p. 285.) places him between the death of Joseph and the departure from Egypt. But whoever wishes to see the most probable and satisfactory account, may consult the table of descent given by Kennicott, (*Remarks*, &c. p. 152,) in which Job is represented as contemporary with Amram, the father of Moses; Eliphaz the Temanite, who was the fifth from Abraham, being contemporary with both. Mr Heath agrees with this account, in placing the death of Job about fourteen years before the Exodus.

III. The third and last question now comes to be considered; namely, what date, and author, are to be assigned to the Book of Job. That the poem is as ancient as its subject, and that Job was not only the hero but the author of the work, is the opinion of many distinguished commentators. The objections brought against this opinion are derived from marks of later times, which it is said are to be discerned in the work, and which are copiously summed up and largely insisted on by Mr Heath.

1. It is urged, that there is frequent allusion to the laws of Moses. On the directly opposite presumption it had been pronounced, that the book could not have been written at a late period, for the benefit of the Jews; inasmuch as there is not to be found in it, "one single word of the law of Moses, nor so much as one distant allusion to any rite or ceremony of the law."[8] The instances adduced by Heath, in support of his position, are taken from Job, iii. 19, and xli. 14, and xxxi. 28; the two first of which, in speaking of *manumission*, and *eternal servitude*, allude, as he says, to the law in Exod. xxi. 2—6, concerning the release of the Hebrew servant in the seventh year, and the ceremony of piercing the ear where an eternal servitude was consented to: and the third, in describing idolatry as "a crime to be punished by the judge," must, as he thinks, relate to the Mosaic dispensation; the laws of the Mosaic polity being the only ones in the world which punished idolatry. (*Essay towards a New Version*, p. 129.) As to the two first instances, the resemblance is so imaginary, or, rather, so truly chimerical an idea, as not to deserve an answer: if the reader, however, wish to see one, he will find it in Mich. *Not. et Epim.* p. 189. To the third, which has also the authority of Warburton and Mr Locke, it may be

---

[7] Geddes, in his *Critical Remarks*, truly observes, on the word קשיטה in this passage, that "most interpreters, after the Sept. have understood it of lambs, more particularly ewe-lambs. So equivalently (he adds) all the ancient versions. Some have imagined (he says) that it was a piece of money with the figure of a lamb on it: which is highly improbable, as coined money is of a much later date."

[8] See Sherlock's *Use of Proph.* Diss. ii. p. 207; see also Lowth, *Prælect.* xxxii. p. 312.

replied, that Scripture decides the point; as it informs us, that Abraham was called from Chaldea on account of the increase of idolatry, to raise a people for the preservation of the worship of the true God: so that the allusion to the exertion of judicial authority against idolatry, was most naturally to be expected from a descendant of this patriarch, and, it may be added, from one not far removed. See Lowth's *Lectures,* &c. Greg. ed. vol. ii. pp. 354, 355; also Michael. *Not. et Epim.* p. 190; and especially Peters, *Crit. Diss. pref.* p. iii.—xii. where this point receives the most ample examination.

2. It is contended that there are allusions, not only to the laws, but to the history, of the Jewish people. But these allusions, as stated by Heath, are so extremely fanciful, as in the opinion of Michaelis to require no farther refutation than the bare reading of the passages referred to (*Not. et Epim.* pp. 191, 192.) Some of the same kind had been urged by Warburton, (*Div. Leg.* B. vi. § ii. vol. iii. pp. 494—499,) and proved to be futile and visionary by Peters, (*Crit. Diss.* p. 28—36.) Indeed, these points have been so completely canvassed, that we may now with confidence pronounce, as Sherlock had done before, (*Use of Proph.* p. 297,) that there is no one allusion, direct or indirect, either to the law, or to the history, of the Jews, that can be fairly pointed out in the Book of Job.

But, 3. It is maintained, both by Heath and Warburton, that the use of the word *Jehovah* determines the date of the book to be later than the age of Moses: God not having been known by that name, until he appeared to Moses, as he himself declares, in Exod. vi. 3. This, however, is evidently a misapprehension of the meaning of the passage in Exodus: it being certain, that God was known to the patriarchs, Abraham and Jacob, by the name of Jehovah; that he calls himself by that name in speaking to them; and is so called by them again expressly.[9] The sense of the passage then must be, not that the *name* was unknown to all before Moses, but its true *signification;* that is, the nature and properties of the *self-existent* Being, expressed by that comprehensive name *Jehovah,* which in the original signifies, according to Le Clerc, and almost all the commentators, "faithful and steadfast, making things to be," that is, fulfilling all his promises, which he began to accomplish in the time of Moses. By this name, then, in its true sense, God certainly was not known, or, as Peters renders it, was not distinguished, before the time of Moses.[10] This objection may, consequently, be set aside.

Nor will the 4th objection, derived from the mention of *Satan,* be found to have greater weight. The *Evil Being,* it is contended both by Heath and Warburton, was not known to the Jews in early days; and the word *Satan* never occurs until a late period of their history, as a proper name; in which light it is said to be here necessarily used, as being preceded by the emphatic article ה, השטן, *i. e. the adversary.* But, that the doctrine of an *evil spirit* was not unknown to the Jews at an early day, is evident from the history of Ahab, in which mention is made of it as a thing familiar, and in a manner precisely similar to the present case. Indeed the history of the Fall could scarcely be made intelligible to them without that doctrine; and Warburton himself admits (B. vi. § 2, vol. ii. p. 533,) that the notion of an evil principle had probably arisen "from the history of Satan misunderstood, or imperfectly told, in the first ages of mankind." In the next place the word *Satan,*[11] was clearly not unknown to the early Jews, as appears from the use of it in Numb. xxii. 22, in the story of Balaam. We find it also in 2 Sam. xix. 22; 1 Kings v. 4; xi. 14, 23, 25; Psalm lxxi. 13; cix. 20, 29. But if it be asserted, that it is used in those several places but as a common appellative, yet still neither will it follow, that the *name* might not have been used, as the *being* was certainly known amongst the early Jews; nor does it even appear, that the word is here used as a proper name; as the article may be employed only to mark out that adversary, or accusing spirit amongst the angelic tribe, who had undertaken the office of putting the virtue of Job to trial; so that no part of the objection is valid. See Mich. *Not. et Epim.* pp. 193, 199, and Dathe as referred to p. 324: and on this entire objection consult Warb. *Div. Leg.* vol. ii. pp. 530—535, and Peters's *Crit. Diss.* pp. 88—92

But, 5. It is argued, and upon this point

---

[9] See Gen. xiv. 22; xv. 2, 8, 7; xxiv. 3; xxviii. 13, 16; and xxxii. 9.

[10] See Vatablus, Dath. and Rosenm. *in locum*—also Peters's *Pref. to Crit. Diss.* p. xii.—xvi., and Bishop Kidder's *Comm. on the Five Books of Moses,* vol. i. p. 297. The last named learned expositor, agreeably to the idea suggested above, explains the passage in Exodus thus:—"*Jehovah* denotes not only God's eternal being, but his giving of being to other things, and especially the performing his promise. Now Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, had received promises, but enjoyed not the thing promised. The time was now come in which God would bring to pass what he had promised; and now they should know that he is the Lord. Isaiah, xlix. 23; liii. 6; lx. 16. The knowing him by his name Jehovah, implies the receiving from him what he had promised before," &c. This view of the matter ought to have saved Dr Geddes from the very laborious discussion of the point into which he has entered in his *Critical Remarks,* and finally from the necessity of pronouncing, that "we must either suppose the writer of Exodus in contradiction with the writer of Genesis, or allow that the name *Jehovah* has been put in the mouths of the patriarchs prior to Moses, and in the mouth of God himself, by some posterior copier, corrupting the original passages by substituting for אלהים, the word יהוה, which had in later times become the peculiar name of God among the Hebrews"

[11] See on this word Taylor's *Scheme of Scripture Divinity,* ch. xi.

Heath and most other objectors principally rely, that the Book of Job abounds with Chaldaisms, Syriasms, and Arabisms, which clearly prove the lateness of its production. Now, in opposition to this, we have the authority of the most distinguished scholars and critics, Schultens and Michaelis, in pronouncing that the charge of Chaldaisms is totally erroneous. Those Chaldaisms, on which Le Clerc so confidently relies, by which the plural termination *in* is put for *im*, Schultens asserts to be " Hebraicæ et Arabicæ dictionis, atque vetustissimæ monetæ" (Dr Grey's *Job*, pref. p. xii :) and Michaelis affirms, that of such Chaldaisms as by their present use might evince the lateness of a Hebrew work, not one is to be discovered in this book. (*Not. et Epim.* p. 193.) The prefix of ש, in ch. xv. 30, supposed to be a Chaldaism from אשר, he proves is not so. And, even were it so used, this is shewn by Kennicott (*Remarks*, &c. p. 153,) to supply no argument against the antiquity of the book, that will not equally affect the book of Genesis. That expressions of Syriac and Arabic affinity frequently occur, there can indeed be no question. This stands upon the authority of the most distinguished scholars, Bochart, Pocock, Hottinger, and Walton. (See Wits. *Misc. Sac*, Lib. i. cap. xvi. § 28.) Nor is this denied by Schultens, Kennicott, and Michaelis. But from this they infer the remote antiquity of the work ; since, says Michaelis, the Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic, are not to be considered so much different languages, as dialects of one radical language, originally common to the descendants of Abraham ; and the higher we ascend, the more resemblance we shall consequently find. But besides, Michaelis adds, that one principal reason for our attributing to the Book of Job, Chaldaic, Syriac, and Arabic expressions, may be its very great antiquity, and uncommon sublimity of elevation, occasioning a greater number of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, and expressions difficult to be understood : which commentators are consequently led to explain from those several languages ; not because the words strictly belong to them, but because there are more books, and better understood in those languages, than in the Hebrew ; and hence it is supposed, that the expressions actually belong to those languages.[12]

On this topic, perhaps, so much need not have been said, had not the high authority of Bishop Law given to the objection more consequence than truly belongs to it, by the hint conveyed in his ingenious work on the *Theory of Religion*, (p. 74,) that the subject of it had been " too slightly passed over." Since the time of the Bishop it has received more ample discussion : and from that discussion there seems to arise the strongest argument in favour of the antiquity of the Book of Job. So that we may see the justness of Bishop Lowth's remark, that " from the language, and even from the obscurity, of the work," no less than from its subject, it may fairly be inferred, " to be the most ancient of all the sacred books." *Præl. Hebr.* xxxii.—But not only do these criticisms bear upon the age of the poem, but on the country of its author. For does not the mixture of foreign expressions rather prove that the author was not a Jew ; and does not that of the Arabic particularly, with which it is considered most to abound, indicate its Arabic extraction, which perfectly agrees with the supposition of Job having been its author? And it deserves to be noticed, that even Codurcus, who supposes it to be the work of one of the later prophets, yet conjectures from the style, that the prophet might have been originally from Idumæa,—the very country of Job. (*Præf. ad Job.*)

6. It is objected by Codurcus, Grotius, and Le Clerc, that there are passages in the Book of Job which so strongly resemble some in the Psalms and Proverbs, that we may fairly suppose them to have been taken from those writings. But to this Warburton has well replied, that " if the sacred writers must needs have borrowed trite moral sentences from one another, it may be as fairly said, that the authors of the Psalms borrowed from the Book of Job, as that the author of Job borrowed from the Book of Psalms :" *Div. Leg.* vol. ii. p. 499. See also Peters's *Crit. Diss.* pp. 139—141. And had the learned Bishop been disposed to exercise as unbiassed a criticism upon himself, as he has done upon Grotius and Le Clerc, he would have felt the same argument bearing with equal force against the objection which he has attempted to deduce from the supposed adoption of certain phrases, which are found in other books of the Old Testament. That, however, which the Bishop has not done for himself, Peters has done for him ; by shewing that those few phrases, which he has instanced, have no peculiar stamp of age or country, and bear no marks whatever of being borrowed from other parts of Scripture. (*Crit. Diss.* pp. 26—29.) It should also be observed, that, in opposition to the above-mentioned objection of Grotius, Le Clerc, &c. Bishop Hare has endeavoured to shew, that there is internal evidence that the Psalmist has borrowed from Job, not Job from the Psalmist. And Chappelow (*Comment. on Job*, v. 16, viii. 10, and pref. p. 10,) represents the passages which are common to Job with the writers of the Psalms, Proverbs, &c. as proverbial forms of speech, sentences of instruction, or מלים, *millim*, as they are peculiarly called in Job, transmitted from one age to another. It therefore is not

---

[12] Mich. *Not. et Epim.* pp. 194, 195. See Peters's *Crit. Diss.* pp. 133—137, and 141—143 ; see also Codurc. *Præf. ad Job*, where the necessity of consulting Targums, &c. is urged in a way which fully justifies this solution of Michaelis.

necessary to suppose that either borrowed from the other.

I have now enumerated all the arguments deserving any notice, which have been urged against the antiquity of the Book of Job. How conjectural, unfounded, and futile most of them are, and how inconclusive others, it is not difficult to discover. This indeed they tend to shew, that the more the objections against the antiquity of this book are examined, the stronger will the arguments be found in favour of it. In addition, however, to what has appeared, there are some positive proofs which have been advanced, and which are not a little worthy of consideration. Bishop Patrick has observed, in his preface to Job, that though there is plain mention of the Deluge, and the burning of Sodom, there is no allusion to the drowning of Pharaoh, and the other miraculous works attending the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt: and that Elihu, when expressly reckoning up the different modes of revelation, takes no notice of the revelation made to Moses. These omissions, however, as well as the want of reference to any of the Mosaic rites, though they furnish a decisive proof against the late age of the book, on the supposition of the author being a Jew, yet do so, it must be confessed, only upon that supposition. But it will not be easy to account for the circumstance of the book's containing no allusion to "any one piece of history later than Moses," (Sherl. *Use of Proph.* p. 207,) upon any hypothesis, that places its date lower than the age of the Jewish lawgiver.

Now, if to these considerations be added the characters of antiquity attached to the subject, the conduct, and the language of the work; some of which have already appeared in the discussion of the foregoing objections, and which are in general so strikingly obvious, as to constrain even those who contend for the late production of the work to represent it as written in imitation of early manners; — if we admit with Peters (*Crit. Diss.* p. 143.) that there are expressions in this book, of a stamp so ancient, that they are not to be met with in the Chaldee, Syriac, or any other language at present known; and that many, which rarely occur elsewhere, and are difficult to be explained, are here to be found in their primitive and most simple forms; — if, in short, there be, on the whole, that genuine air of the antique, which those distinguished scholars, Schultens, Lowth, and Michaelis, [13] affirm in every respect to pervade the work, we can scarcely hesitate to pronounce with Lowth and Sherlock, that the Book of Job is the oldest in the world now extant. (*Prœl. Hebr.* and *Use of Proph.* Diss. ii. p. 206.) Taylor draws the same conclusion from a very satisfactory though brief view of the merits of the entire argument, in the 22d chap. of his *Scheme of Scrip. Div.* which I would particularly recommend to the perusal of the reader. It deserves also to be noticed, that a writer [14] in the *Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 73, who is by no means a friend to the idea of the antiquity of the Book of Job, is compelled by the decided marks of the remote and primitive state of the Hebrew, every where discoverable in the work, to pronounce the author to have been a person of great "ability and address; who was master of the old language, and had given a venerable antique air to his poem, by making the persons of his dialogue, supposed to have lived in very early times, speak the language which was spoken in their days." Whether there was any person of such ability and address, it is for this writer to decide. With his admission I am content.

After what has been said, we can have but little difficulty with the systems of Grotius, Warburton, Heath, and others, who suppose the work written at a late period of the Jewish history, for the consolation either of the Edomites when carried away by the Babylonians, (which was the notion of Grotius,) or of the Jews in circumstances of similar distress, after or under the captivity: the former of which was Warburton's, and the latter Garnet's idea. What has been said of the style, and other peculiarities of the Book of Job, necessarily subverts all such theories. And to bring down this sublime poem to the age of the Babylonish captivity, especially to the period succeeding it, would be, as Lowth observes, little different from the error of Harduin, who ascribed the golden verses of Virgil, Horace, &c, to the iron age of monkish pedantry and ignorance. (*Lect.* &c. ed. Greg. vol. ii. p. 355.) Besides, all these theories are utterly inconsistent with the existence of the Book of Job before the time of Ezekiel; a fact which Grotius inferred, and which, notwithstanding Warburton's denial of the consequence, Peters has shewn must be inferred from the mention of Job by that prophet. [15] The supposition, then, that Ezra, Ezekiel, or, indeed, any person subsequent to the age of Moses, was the writer of this book, must, for the reasons that have been assigned, be entirely rejected. It remains, of course, only to inquire, whether it is to be ascribed to Moses, or was written before his time. In either supposition, the antiquity, both of the history and of the book, is sufficiently established, for the purpose of my argument concerning sacrifice; but, on a subject so interesting, we are naturally impelled to look on to the end.

---

[13] See Grey's *Schult. Job.* præf. p. xiii.—*Prœl. Hebr.* p. 310. and Mich. *Not. et Epim.* p. 195.

[14] This writer appears to be Mr Scott, the author of the translation of Job into English verse: the paper in the *Theol. Rep.* being printed as his in an appendix to that translation.

[15] See *Div. Leg.* B. vi. § 2. vol. ii. p. 490, and *Crit. Diss.* pp. 145—150.

That Moses was the author of the book has been the opinion of many, both Jews and Christians. But the arguments which have been used to prove that the writer could not be later than the giving of the law, or the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, will equally prove, that, if the book was the production of Moses, he must have written it before the Exodus. Accordingly, Huet, Michaelis, and Kennicott, who attribute the work to him, have placed it at that early period, and thereby in a good measure escape the force of Bishop Lowth's objection, derived from the want of that allusion to the customs, ceremonies, or history of the Israelites, which he thinks must have appeared, had Moses written the book with a view to the consolation of his people at any time after the promulgation of the law. Michaelis says, that it was probably written by him, to console the Israelites under their Egyptian slavery. (*Not. et Epim.* pp. 181, 182.) And Kennicott thinks, that Moses, having lived a long time in Midian, and on the borders of Idumæa, may well be supposed the author, having there learned the story of Job's fortunes, which was probably then recent; and that thus also may the Arabic forms of expression, which occur in the work, be easily accounted for. *Remarks*, &c. p. 152.

These writers have followed the notion of Huet, and of several of the most ancient Jewish and Christian authors, whom he enumerates. (See *Dem. Evang.* p. 226.) To this opinion, however, it has been objected by Dupin, that "the style of Job is figuratively poetical, and obscure, entirely different from that of the Pentateuch:" and Bishop Lowth, whose judgment with respect to style will scarcely be questioned, does not hesitate to pronounce the style of Job to be materially different from that of Moses, even in his poetic productions; and describes it to be of that compact and sententious kind, which is to be observed in the prophecies of Balaam the Mesopotamian. (*Prœl. Hebr.* xxxii.) Michaelis also admits the force of this criticism, by seeking to account for the dissimilitude, from the supposition that the Book of Job was written by Moses at a very early period of life. (*Not. et Epim.* p. 186.) But although a youthful imagination might sufficiently account for a higher degree of poetic imagery and embellishment, yet it seems a strange reason to assign for a more "compact, condensed style, and a greater accuracy in the poetical conformation of the sentences," which is the character attributed to it by Lowth, as distinguishing it from the Pentateuch.

Kennicott, however, it must be confessed, differs from the bishop so far as to affirm, that there is a striking resemblance in the construction of the poetry of Job to the song of Moses in Deut. xxxi. (*Remarks,* &c. p. 153.) But even admitting his discernment of the graces and characters of style to be equal to that of the elegant composer of the Lectures on the Hebrew poetry, and the sublime translator of Isaiah, yet still it remains to be inquired, whence were derived those expressions of Syriac and Arabic origin, which are not to be discovered in the Pentateuch? If it be said, as Father Simon has expressly alleged, (*Crit. des Proleg. de Dup.* lib. v. p. 514,) and as is hinted also by Kennicott, that Moses might have learned these dialects whilst in the land of Midian, it then remains to be explained, how he came to unlearn them again, before he wrote the Pentateuch. As to one particular sameness of expression, which Kennicott thinks he discovers in the Pentateuch and Job, namely, the frequent use of the *future* for the *preterite;* if this were indeed a peculiarity confined to these[16] two parts of the sacred volume, might it not be accounted for, by supposing it to have been the usage of the language in its earliest period, and which, though it did not descend later than the writings of Moses, yet might have been common to that and the preceding ages?

But, admitting even a similarity of style, one great difficulty still hangs upon the hypothesis, that Moses was the author of the book; namely, that as he must have intended it for the Israelites, it is scarcely possible to conceive, that, although relating an Idumæan history, he should not have introduced something referring to the peculiar state and circumstances of the people, for whose use it was destined; of which no trace whatever appears in the work. The common subjects touched upon in both, too, we should expect to find similarly handled: and yet, if Peters's remark be just, the manner in which the Creation, the Fall, the Deluge, and other points of ancient history, are treated in the Book of Job, is widely different from that in which they are spoken of in the books of Moses. See *Crit. Diss.* p. 126.

---

[16] The learned critic has been obliged to confess, on subsequent consideration, that the conversion of the future into the *preterite* by the ו prefixed, is not strictly confined to the Pentateuch and the Book of Job; and he himself adduces instances of a similar usage from Judges and Isaiah; and thus, in truth, does away the force of his own observation. He adds, however, in support of his first position, that "this idiom, being seldom found elsewhere, and being found so often, and within so few verses, both in the Pentateuch and Job, must certainly add some weight to the opinion that these books came from the same writer." (*Remarks,* &c. pp. 153, 154.)

In the criticism here advanced, this distinguished scholar has not exercised his usual caution and research. The fact differs most widely from his assertion. For it is certain, as we have been most truly told in a late ingenious publication, that, throughout the *whole* Hebrew Scriptures, the *perfect tense* is most generally expressed by the *converted future;* so that it is clearly the proper idiom of the language. And it is with justice added, that this is a peculiarity of a nature so extraordinary as to be highly deserving of attention; because the regularity of its changes will bear the strictest examination, whereby may be demonstrated the great grammatical accuracy and propriety of expression that has been observed by all the writers of the Hebrew Scriptures for so many years, from Moses to Malachi. This position is substantiated by a wide range of examples in the *Letter on certain particularities of the Hebrew Syntax,* written by Mr Granville Sharp, whose acute and valuable philological inquiries as well in that and his other Letters on the same subject, as in his investigations of the Greek text, cannot be too highly commended. The labours of this learned layman reflect honour upon himself, and, what he appears to have much more at heart, light and intelligence upon the sacred text. Lowth in his *Lectures,* vol. i. p. 336—345, has treated of the above peculiarity of the Hebrew tenses.

There seems, then, upon the whole, sufficient ground for the conclusion, that this book was not the production of Moses, but of some earlier age: and there appears no good reason to suppose, that it was not written by Job himself. Lowth favours this idea, and Peters urges some arguments, of no inconsiderable weight, in its support. (*Crit. Diss.* pp. 123—125.) The objections against it, from Arabia being called *the East*, (which, according to Grotius and Le Clerc, marks the writer to be a Hebrew,) and from the account given of the death of Job in the conclusion, create no difficulty. Peters has shewn, that not only did other nations, beside the Hebrews, call Arabia, *the East*; but that it was customary even with the Arabians themselves: and that the writer was an Arabian, he infers, with much ingenuity, from the manner in which he speaks of the North wind. As for the addition of a few lines at the conclusion, made by some other hand, for the purpose of completing the history; this should no more invalidate Job's title to the work, than a similar addition at the conclusion of Deuteronomy, should invalidate that of Moses to the Pentateuch. See *Crit. Diss.* pp. 127, 128. and pref. p. xvi.

But, whether we suppose Job the author of the book or not, its great antiquity, and even its priority to the age of Moses, seems to stand on strong grounds. And, upon the whole, perhaps we may not unreasonably conjecture the history of the book to be this:—The poem, being originally written either by Job, or some contemporary of his, and existing in the time of Moses, might fall into his hands, whilst residing in the land of Midian, or afterwards when in the neighbourhood of Idumæa; and might naturally be made use of by him, to represent to the Hebrews, either whilst repining under their Egyptian bondage, or murmuring at their long wanderings in the wilderness, the great duty of submission to the will of God. The encouragement which this book holds out, that every good man suffering patiently will finally be rewarded, rendered it a work peculiarly calculated to minister mingled comfort and rebuke to the distressed and discontented Israelites, and might therefore well have been employed by Moses for this purpose. We may also suppose, that Moses, in transcribing, might have made some small and unimportant alterations, which will sufficiently account for occasional and partial resemblances of expression between it and the Pentateuch, if any such there be.

This hypothesis both furnishes a reasonable compromise between the opinions of the great critics who are divided upon the point of Moses being the author, and supplies an answer to a question of no small difficulty, which hangs upon almost every other solution; namely, when, and wherefore, a book treating manifestly of the concerns of a stranger, and in no way connected with their affairs, was received by the Jews into their sacred canon? For Moses having thus applied the book to their use, and sanctioned it by his authority, it would naturally have been enrolled among their sacred writings: and, from the antiquity of that enrolment, no record would, consequently, appear of its introduction. This hypothesis satisfies the third query in the *Theol. Repos.* vol. i. p. 72. I have the satisfaction also to find, that this notion is not without support from many respectable authorities. The ancient commentator on Job, under the title of Origen, has handed down a piece of traditional history, which perfectly accords with it. See Patrick's *Preface to Job.* Many of the most respectable early writers seem to have adopted the same idea, as may be seen in Huet, (*Dem. Evang.* p. 226,) and, with some slight variation, it has been followed by that learned author. Patrick also and Peters speak of it as a reasonable hypothesis. (*Crit. Diss.* pref. pp. xxxiv. xxxv.) And certainly it possesses this decided advantage, that it solves all the phenomena.

One observation more remains to be offered; and that is, that there is good reason to pronounce the Book of Job an inspired work. Its reception into the Jewish canon; the recognition of the history, and, as Peters has abundantly proved, (*Crit. Diss.* pp. 21, 145—148,) consequently of the book itself, by the prophet Ezekiel; a similar admission of it by another inspired writer, Saint James; and the express reference made to it by Saint Paul, (1 Cor. iii. 19,) who prefaces his quotation from it by the words, *it is written*, agreeably to the common form of quoting from other parts of inspired Scripture;—all these fully justify the primitive fathers, and early councils, in their reception of it as a canonical and inspired book. (See Gregor. *pref. in Job.*)

The intrinsic matter of the work also strengthens this idea. Job appears, from xxxviii. 1, and xlii. 5, to have enjoyed the divine vision. In what manner, whether, as the Seventy seem to think, by some appearance of a glorious cloud, or otherwise, it avails not. That, in some way, he was honoured with one of those extraordinary manifestations of the Deity, by which the prophets and inspired persons were distinguished, and that he was admitted to immediate communication with the Almighty, is positively asserted. Now, if this did really happen, — and the whole book becomes a lying fable, and a lying fable recognized by inspired writers as a truth, if it did not, — it necessarily follows, that Job was a prophet: and as a natural consequence it must be admitted, that Job himself was the author of the work: since it cannot be supposed, that God would convey supernatural communications to one person, and appoint another to relate them. That Job was not an Israelite, cannot be urged as an argument against such an hypothesis, since we find that Balaam is expressly said to have been similarly favoured. Other instances also are given by Bishop Law in his *Considerations*, &c. pp. 72 — 76. See also Patrick's *Append. to the Paraph. on Job*, and Peters's *Crit. Diss.* pp. 123 — 125.

Now, from admitting the prophetic character of Job, we derive two considerable advantages. First, it removes the difficulty, which otherwise must hang upon the supposition, that the words of that much celebrated passage in his writings refer to the doctrines of a Redeemer and a future state:[17] and, 2. it supplies an additional confirmation of the divine origin of those great truths concerning the Creation, the Fall, and the Deluge, as they stand recorded in the books of Moses.

If I have dwelt rather long upon this point, I trust that the interesting nature of the subject, as well as the importance of the reality and antiquity of Job, in an examination of the history of sacrifice, will supply a sufficient excuse. I have little fear that the discussion will appear unnecessarily prolix to those who are acquainted with the vast variety of opinions, and multiplicity of arguments, to which this question has given birth. My principal object in this, as in most other of the dissertations in this work, has been to combine with such illustrations as the general argument may require, useful directions to the young student in divinity, as to those leading topics and references, that may serve to assist his course of reading. This I have done on the present occasion with all possible brevity. A greater degree of compression must have led to dryness and obscurity. It will be well, if, even in its present form, this review of the question be not found chargeable with these defects.

After the full detail which has just been given of the various opinions respecting the age and country of Job, as well as respecting the date of the poem which bears that name, I might, perhaps, deem myself excused from making any additional remarks upon this subject, even in the face of a translation of that poem, which has lately come before the public, accompanied with observations repugnant to the resulting probabilities as they have been here deduced, but not less repugnant (as I conceive) to the truth of Scripture history and the principles of fair interpretation. These observations, however, coming from a prelate of the Established Church, acquire from that circumstance a weight, which will not permit them to be overlooked; and compel a discussion, in which I feel myself bound (however reluctantly) to engage, in defence of what I have already submitted, and of what appears to me to be equally sustained by argument, and sanctioned by Scripture. That I may not do the right reverend author injustice, I quote the very words, in which he has so summarily beaten down the notions hitherto so generally entertained, concerning the antiquity both of the book and of the age of Job.

"The sacred writers, in general, have been apt to ascribe to the Book of Job, an origin, that loses itself in the shades of the remotest antiquity. The opinion, I believe, rested at first on the very sandy foundation of what is stated in the two concluding verses of the work, which ascribe to its hero a longevity that belonged only to the generations not far distant from the Flood. Of the authenticity of those verses, I think I have shewn, in my note on them, that we have every reason to be suspicious. But, if it were ever so difficult to ascertain the portion of time when the Patriarch lived, it may not be impossible, from the internal marks in the poem itself, to conjecture with tolerable certainty the era of its author. This is what I have attempted to execute. The subject is curious, and, on a close inspection of the work before us, certain notes of time have presented themselves to my observation, which appear to have escaped the diligence of all preceding critics. The reader will allow me to offer them to him here in a summary manner; referring him for farther satisfaction on the point to what I have said in the notes. — Allusions to events recorded in the five books of Moses are to be found in this poem, ch. xx. 20, compared with Num. xi. 33, 34; ch. xxvi. 5, compared with Gen. vi. 4, 7, 11; ch. xxxiv. 20, compared with Exod. xii. 19; ch. xxxi. 33, compared with Gen. iii. 8, 12: and I shall hardly be expected to prove, that the author of the poem derived his knowledge of those events from a history of so much notoriety as that of Moses, rather than from oral or any other tradition. Facts are not usually referred to, before the history recording them has had time to obtain currency. The inference is clear; the writer of Job was junior to the Jewish legislator, and junior, it is likely, by some time. — A similar mode of reasoning, upon comparison of ch. xxxiii. 23, with 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, 1 Chron. xxi. 15, will, if I mistake not greatly, bring down the date of our poem below the time of King David. — Lastly, ch. xii. 17, to the end, seems to point to the circumstances preceding and attending the Babylonish captivity; and chap. xxxvi. 8—12, has an appearance of alluding to the various fortunes of Jehoiachin, king of Judah, 2 Kings, xxiv. 12; xxv. 27. — Notes of time these, which, though not so manifest as the forementioned, may deserve attention; since they add strength to the sentiment of those learned men who have been inclined to give the honour of this celebrated composition to Ezra." — *The Book of Job newly translated by the Right Reverend Joseph Stock, Bishop of Killalla,* pref. pp. v. vi.

---

[17] In addition to the numerous writers, who are commonly known to have maintained the application of the 19th chapter of Job to the doctrine of a future state, I think it right to mention the name of Velthusen, who, in his *Exercitationes Criticæ in Jobi*, cap. xix. 23—29, has with much ability and critical acumen defended this idea. See also Pfeiffer, *Dubia Vexata*, 505—511.

Such is the rapid decision of the Right Rev. translator, upon a question which has occupied the attention, and divided the judgments, of the most learned and able theologians; and such are the new lights, whereby this new expositor of the Book of Job is enabled to discern the erroneousness of the opinion in favour of its high antiquity, which has at all times most generally prevailed. It must be remarked, indeed, that his Lordship, in the history of his work, has stated, that the whole was executed in a period of six weeks, and that too a period of great agitation and distraction of mind; and also, that he declined the aid of the many learned commentators, who had gone before him in the translation of this most difficult book, confining his attention to three English writers, Heath, Scott, and Parkhurst; writers, who, however respectably they may rank as compilers, cannot be named with those great and distinguished Hebrew scholars,[18] whose labours his Lordship found it convenient to reject. These circumstances will abundantly account for the cursory manner in which his Lordship has treated the subject of the antiquity of the Book of Job; for the errors into which he has fallen upon that important point; and also for the general air and character of the translation itself.

And, in the first instance, it is painful to remark, that in the very first paragraph of the work, his Lordship has confounded two questions which are altogether distinct; and, from this confusion, has been led (with a licence which might better befit such expositors as Dr Geddes, or the Unitarian Society, than a Bishop of the Established Church,) to reject the two last verses of Job, as a spurious addition to the work.

The two questions relate, one to the time at which Job actually lived, and the other to the time at which the Book of Job was written. These, it is obvious, have no necessary connection, as the history of a person who lived in the patriarchal age might be composed even at the present day; and, therefore, these respective dates have, at all times, been made the subjects of separate inquiry. Yet the Bishop begins by telling us, that the reason which first induced the sacred critics to assign the Book of Job to an era of remote antiquity, is to be found in the two last verses, which ascribe to Job himself a patriarchal longevity; that is, that the critics have pronounced the Book of Job to be extremely ancient, because that book describes its subject as having lived at a very early period. Now, no critics have reasoned in this manner; nor, in truth, could any have so reasoned, who deserved the name. Some, indeed, have pronounced the book to be as ancient as its subject, inasmuch as they conceived it to have been the production of Job himself. But they who do not contend for this, and even those (such as Warburton and Heath[19]) who have been desirous to reduce the date of the book to a very late period of the Jewish state, in consequence of allusions to certain parts of the Jewish history which it appeared to them to contain, have, notwithstanding, found no difficulty in placing the existence of Job in that remote age to which the history assigns it. They have, in short, argued thus:—Job lived at an early period; but we have reason to conclude, that the history which treats of him was composed at a period considerably later. Whereas the present translator argues as if Job could not have lived early, because the history was written late. Or rather, to repeat the charge already made, two ideas totally distinct, the time of Job, and the date of the history, are manifestly confounded And this confusion, which so inauspiciously prefaces his Lordship's work, unhappily conducts it to its close: for in the concluding note we find the following observations:—"These two last verses have every appearance[20] of being a spurious addition to the work, fabricated by such another dealer in the marvellous, as he that has fastened his long string of fables to the close of the translation by the LXX interpreters. The fallacy must be obvious, when we call to mind the allusions, in the poem, to facts that happened in and after the time of Moses, who lived but one hundred and twenty years, and even of David, when the age of man was reduced to its present standard of seventy years."

---

[18] It was particularly unfortunate, that his Lordship felt indisposed to the trouble of consulting the commentary of Schultens; a work, which, although its author is rather slightingly described by his Lordship as the "Dutch expositor," has been considered by all the later interpreters of Job, his Lordship excepted, as a mine of the most valuable learning, and particularly indispensable to such as were not acquainted with the Arabic, and what may be called the dialects of the Hebrew, in which it is acknowledged by every commentator that the Book of Job abounds, and from which, indeed, the peculiar difficulty of that book is admitted to arise. Dr Grey, in his preface, speaking of this work, terms it "egregium opus." And of the benefit he derived from it in his translation of Job, he thus expresses himself: — "Quantum mihi gaudium attulerit, quantâque curâ et molestiâ liberarit elaboratissimum hocce summi viri eruditionis atque diligentiæ monumentum, facile dijudicare est. Parata, ut ait Plinius, inquisitio, nec onerosa collatio. Nempe omni isto apparatu illico jam instructus eram, quem alioquin mihi multo cum sudore undecunque conquirendum esse prævideram: unoque sub conspectu habui non tantum quicquid uspiam a doctissimis viris in hoc argumento concinnatum, sed et ordine ita accurato dispositum, eo judicio atque diligentia perpensum, ut nil alind mihi negotii jam relictum videretur, quam exscriptoris munere perfungi." — *Liber Jobi* — Ricard. Grey, præf. p. iii.

Heath also, in his pref. p. xiii. speaks of the work of Schultens in language equally strong. "The use of the dialects in the investigation of the true meaning of the several roots in this" (the Hebrew) "language, was never carried to the height it is at present, till the late very learned Albert Schultens, in the beginning of this" (the last) "century, bent his studies this way; and with so great success, that I think it may be truly said in his praise, that his endeavours have contributed more towards the true knowledge of the Hebrew language, than the united labours of all that went before him."

Was this the commentator, from whose "two ponderous volumes," (which, after all, are but two thin quartos,) a translator of the Book of Job, who does not profess either to have any acquaintance with the Arabic, should turn away with weariness and disgust? Heath pursues a different course in his version: — "I have drawn (says he) from the dialects all the light my knowledge in them would supply me with; and in this part I acknowledge myself much indebted to the valuable works of the late very learned Albert Schultens." — Pref. page xv. Bishop Stock, on the other hand, tells us, that he had "received from Scott, as much information with respect to the discoveries of Schultens, the Dutch expositor, as he wished to possess." — Pref. p. vii. This surely is in every way an odd declaration. If one were only to ask, how the *quantum sufficit* could be ascertained, without the knowledge of what Schultens' book actually contains, it would be rather difficult to frame an answer.

Thus, then, it appears, that because the translator thinks proper to bring the date of the Book of Job lower than the time of David, the length of the life of Job could not exceed what was usual in that age of the world, and therefore the two verses which ascribe to him a longer period cannot be genuine, and must be discarded from the sacred text. That is, in other words, no history can ever be written of any individual who lived at a preceding period. This is certainly an unhappy specimen of antiquarian research; and a still more unhappy specimen of biblical criticism. On

---

[19] Heath, indeed, specially remarks upon the gross error of not making a due distinction between the times of Job, and those of the author of the poem: and on the whole he pronounces it as his own opinion, that the author in many parts of his work alludes to facts, which, though undoubtedly posterior to the age of Job, on account of its great remoteness, were yet anterior to his own; and consequently he holds, that no argument can be drawn from such circumstances against the antiquity of the times of Job on the one hand, nor against interpretations suited to the manners and history of the probable age of the author on the other. And therefore, although he reduces the date of the author of the poem as low as the Bishop of Killalla can desire, he yet conjectures the time of Job to have been earlier than the Exodus, and considers the length of life ascribed to him by the two verses with which the Bishop has quarrelled, as one of the proofs of the fact. See Heath's *English Version of Job*, pp. xix. xx. xxiv.

[20] What the circumstances are, that give to these two verses "every appearance of being a spurious addition to the work," his Lordship has not thought proper to mention. What do these verses contain? Simply the following words:—"After this lived Job an hundred and forty years, and saw his sons and his sons' sons, even four generations. So Job died, being old and full of days." Now, if all that is meant be this, that the verses could not have been written by Job himself, this undoubtedly no person will be found disposed to dispute, as it is not pretended that he rose from the grave to finish the book. But this surely cannot be the proof of their want of authenticity, which, in the beginning of his preface, his Lordship boasts of having discovered, and promises to produce in his note upon the verses: and, in point of fact, he does not here adduce it as a proof; but simply asserts, as we have seen, that the "verses have every appearance of being a spurious addition to the work." He goes on, indeed, to state of this addition, that it has been "fabricated by such another dealer in the marvellous, as he that has fastened his long string of fables to the close of the translation by the LXX interpreters." Now, with great deference to his Lordship, there is not only no appearance of these verses being such a fabrication as that which winds up the conclusion of the Septuagint translation, (and his Lordship might have added, of the Syriac and Arabic also,) but there is as direct and proper evidence of the contrary as the nature of the case will admit. The difference between the two is precisely this, that the one is found in every MS. of the original Hebrew, and the other has nothing corresponding to it in any; that the one has, in all ages, been received without question as part of the canon of Scripture, and the other never: that the one, in short, is found in the record, and the other is not. Such is the similarity of appearance between the two, from which his Lordship infers them on the view, to be equally fabrications! Surely never was there a more arbitrary and barefaced attack upon the integrity of the sacred text. The verses have never been questioned; they appear in every MS. of the Hebrew; and they stand precisely on the same ground, as to every circumstance of genuineness, with any other verses in the entire Book of Job. It must be observed, that what is said here is perfectly admissible, even on the supposition that Job himself was the author of the poem: the argument not requiring that the two concluding verses should have been written by the same hand that composed the remainder of the work; but that they were, equally with any other verses, genuine parts of the book as it was originally received into the Hebrew canon, and not the unauthorized and spurious addition of an unknown fabricator. That the verses in question were written by Moses, at the time when the entire work was adapted by him, and accommodated to the uses of his followers, may appear not improbable from what has been said at page 157 of this volume.

But, perhaps, after all, no other proof of the spuriousness of these two verses has been intended by the right reverend author, than what arises from those allusions to facts later than the time of Moses, and even of David, to which his Lordship immediately after adverts. If this be the case, then, in addition to the confounding together the times of Job and of the author of the book, which has been remarked upon above, his Lordship has conducted the entire of his reasoning in a circle: having promised, in his preface, to overturn the notion of the high antiquity of the Book of Job, by establishing the spuriousness of these two verses, on which he states that notion to have been founded; and having here established the spuriousness of the verses, by denying the antiquity of the book. Whatever may be the errors in the argument, his Lordship, however, seems to think that all will be set to rights, by rejecting from the sacred text whatever does not correspond with the theory which he has adopted.

As the discussion of this subject has led to the mention of the addition made by the LXX, at the conclusion of their version of the Book of Job, it may gratify the curiosity of the reader who is not conversant in these matters, to know what that addition is. Having, agreeably to the Hebrew original, stated that Job died full of days, the Greek proceeds, "But it is written that he will rise again with those whom the Lord raises up. This is interpreted from a Syriac book. 'He dwelt in the land of Ausitis' (of Aus or Uz,) 'in the borders of Idumæa and Arabia; but his name was first called Jobab: and, marrying an Arabian wife, he begot a son, whose name was Ennon; and he was himself the son of Zare, a grandson of Esau, of a mother Bosorra, so that he was the fifth from Abraham. And these are the same ground on which he has rejected the two concluding verses, the right reverend critic might reject a very large portion of the Book of Job, as a spurious addition to the genuine work; since every where throughout are plentifully scattered those indications[21] of patriarchal antiquity, for the direct exposition of which these two last verses are pronounced to be surreptitious.

But, not to dwell any longer on this unfortunate mistake, and the rash attempt at mutilating the sacred text which it has occasioned, let us proceed to consider those notes of time, attaching to the poem itself, which "have escaped the diligence of all preceding critics;" and by the discovery of which, his Lordship thinks himself enabled to pronounce upon the lateness of its production.

The first of these is said to be found in chap. xx. 20, in which we are told that the true rendering is, "Because he acknowledged not the quail in his stomach:" and the following remark is subjoined:—"Here, I apprehend, is a fresh example of the known usage of the Hebrew poets, in adorning their compositions by allusions to facts in the history of their own people. It has escaped all the interpreters; and it is the more important, because it fixes the date of this poem so far as to prove its having been composed subsequently to the transgression of Israel at Kibroth-hataavah, recorded in Numb. xi. 33, 34. Because the wicked acknowledged not the quail, that is, the meat with which God had filled his stomach, but, like the ungrateful Israelites, 'crammed and blasphemed his feeder,' (as Milton finely expresseth it,) he shall experience the same punishment with them, and be cut off בחמודו, in the midst of his enjoyment, as Moses tells us the people were המתאוים, who lusted."

The Bishop has rightly said, that the translation which he has here given "has escaped all the interpreters;" at the same time, as he has himself informed us that his acquaintance with the interpreters of this book has been studiously contracted to a very narrow range, it remains to be explained how his Lordship came to ascertain this fact. True, however, it is, that none of the commentators on Job, either ancient or modern, had ever proposed such a version of the passage. Yet possibly, from this circumstance, an inference, differing widely from that which the translator would approve, might suggest itself to the reader.

But, what are the grounds on which this unexampled signification of the passage has been adopted by the Right Rev. translator? There is but one pretended; namely, that the word שלו, which occurs in this place, has been rendered *quail* in the book of Numbers. When this has been stated, the only reason that can be assigned for this translation has been given. The phrase itself, as it is here proposed, receives no justification from any parallel passage or similarity of expression, throughout the entire body of the Scriptures. No proverbial form, such as, "not acknowledging the quail," has ever been heard of as in use amongst the Jews: and, even though there had been such a phrase derived from the translation recorded in the book of Numbers, it would have been peculiarly inapplicable here, where the food, with which the wicked oppressor is said to gorge himself, is not the gift of God, like the quails showered down for the Israelites, but, on the contrary, the fruit of his own fraud and violence. Besides, the phrase itself is as inconsistent with the history in Numbers, as it is inapplicable to the reasoning in Job. For we do not find that the Israelites were cut off because of their "not acknowledging the quail," (by which, if it has any meaning, must be understood, their not receiving that food as a gift sent from God, and in this sense it is that the Bishop has actually applied it,) but because, as both Moses and the Psalmist (Psal. lxxviii.) inform us, they had, antecedent to the grant of the quails, wantonly lusted[22] for food

---

the kings which reigned in Edom, over which country he ruled; first, Balak son of Beor, and the name of his city was Denhaba; but after Balak Jobab, called Job; but after him Asom, prince of the land of Theman; and after him Adad, son of Barad, who smote Midian in the plain of Moab, and the name of his city was Gethiam. And the friends who came to him, were Eliphaz of the sons of Esau, king of the Themanites; Baldad, sovereign (τύϱαννος) of the Sauchæans; and Zophar, king of the Minæans.'" With this the Syriac and Arabic, as given in the Polyglot, nearly correspond. And a fragment of Aristæas, as taken from Eusebius (*Præp. Evang.* lib. ix. cap. xxv. tom. i. p. 430,) contains most of these particulars, referring to Polyhistor as his authority. On the passage in the Greek it is to be remarked, that it contains internal evidence, that the Book of Job has not had the same Greek interpreters that have rendered the other books of the Old Testament; since it expressly states, that the version was derived from a Syriac book. And, indeed, it is clear upon inspection, that the Greek interpreters of Job have taken uncommon liberties in their translation; having, besides variations from the obvious sense of the Hebrew as it now stands, made large additions, not only here, but in several other places, particularly at chap. ii. 9, to the speech made by Job's wife. See also chap. xix. 4; xxxvi. 28; xxxix. 34. It is to be noted also, that the concluding addition to Job in the Greek is given differently by the Vatican and the Alexandrian MSS.; that it is found in Theodotion, but not in Aquila or Symmachus; and that in the Complutensian edition of the LXX it is wanting. It is said also to have been in the Old Italic. At what time it was introduced cannot be conjectured; but the Greek version of Job appears to have been earlier than Philo Judæus, from his quoting it in his book, *De Nominum Mutatione*. See Wesley, *Dissert.* LIII. p. 409—413. and p. 599; *Hod. de Vers. Græc.* p. 196; also Drusius and Codurcus on the last verse of Job, and Carpzov's *Defence*, p. 36, &c. For the sources whence this piece of adscititious history was probably derived, the reader may turn to Gen. xxxvi. and 1 Chron. i.

[21] See pp. 151, 155. of this volume for the proof and general admission of this point.

[22] The very name of *Kibroth-hataavah* was given to the place to mark the nature of the crime; the signification of these words being *sepulchra concupiscentiæ*, "because there they buried the people that lusted."—Numb. xi. 34. See on this particularly Bochart, vol. iii. pp. 92, 103, 109.

different from that which God had already allotted to them, and were desirous, from their want of confidence in God's power to give them flesh for food, to return to the flesh-pots of Egypt. For these reasons it was, that punishment was inflicted; and inflicted too (so far from having been caused by their "not acknowledging the quail,") before the food was actually swallowed; whilst, as we are told, "it was yet between the teeth, and not yet chewed." (See Numb. xi. 33.)

To the new version, then, here recommended, there lie these three objections: 1. That we find no instance of the phrase which it introduces, throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, nor amongst the traditions of the Jews: 2. That such a phrase could not have grown out of the transaction to which it is traced: and, 3. That, if it could, it would be totally inapplicable to the passage in question. With how little reason, upon the whole, the Bishop has departed from the commonly received sense of the text, which requires the word to be rendered in the sense of *quietness*,[23] there needs but a slight inspection of the original to discover. And with how much less reason he has pretended to find in the version which he has substituted, a *proof* (as he is pleased to call it,) that the Book of Job was composed subsequently to the transaction at *Kibroth-hataavah*, will probably, after what has been said, appear no less clear.

The next passage to which the Bishop refers us for a mark of time, is ch. xxvi. 5, which he thus translates: —

> "The mighty dead are pierced through;
> The waters from beneath, and their inhabitants."[24]

And on this the only remark he thinks necessary to make, is, that he "agrees with Scott, that רפאים are *the giants*, and wicked inhabitants of the old world, who perished in the Flood, produced by breaking up "the waters from beneath," or the fountains of the great deep, as Moses call them, Gen. vii. 11."

Now, admitting, for the sake of argument, that the antediluvian *giants*, who with the wicked inhabitants of the old world were overwhelmed by the Flood, have been here intended by the epithet רפאים *Rephaim;* there arises from this very circumstance a proof, that the inference which the Bishop would hence deduce, respecting the priority of Moses to the author of this poem, is a false one. For those *giants* of the old world are called by Moses נפלים, *Nephilim;* and in no one instance by the name of *Rephaim*, which is here applied. So that if we really have, in this place, an allusion to those *giants* who lived before the Flood, we must suppose the knowledge of the writer to have been derived from some source different from the writings of Moses: a conclusion, directly the opposite of that which it has been the Bishop's object to establish. His Lordship, indeed, tells us, that he expects not to be called upon "to prove, that the author of the poem derived his knowledge of events from a history of so much notoriety as that of Moses, rather than from oral or any other tradition." But, surely, in facts so notorious as those of the Deluge, and of the existence of those giants and wicked men who preceded it, it cannot be thought too much to demand, that some marked similitude between the accounts given of them by Moses and by any other early writer should be adduced, in proof that either borrowed from the other. At all events, it is clearly too much on the other hand to expect, that this should be conceded, in defiance of a marked dissimilitude, such as has been shewn in the present case to exist. And, after all, even were a resemblance discoverable, the question, Which was the earliest writer? would still remain exactly as before.

---

[23] The word שלו, which Bishop Stock here renders *quail*, is, as has been noticed above, so employed in speaking of the food miraculously afforded to the Israelites at Kibroth-hataavah, and occurs in that sense in four places; namely, in Exod. xvi. 13; Numb. xi. 31, 32, and Psalm cv. 40. In the various other parts of Scripture, in which the word is to be found, it is used in the sense of *quiet and tranquil enjoyment:* and from this, as its radical meaning, even its application to the bird above named is commonly explained; inasmuch as quails are conceived to be a species of birds, that seek quiet and undisturbed enjoyment in the fields of corn, where they conceal themselves in large flocks, and if allowed to enjoy rest, fatten prodigiously. See Kircher's *Concordance* and Parkhurst on the word. Abbé Pluche tells us, in his *Histoire du Ciel*, tom. i. p. 247, that the quail was, amongst the ancient Egyptians, the emblem of peace and security: and Hasselquist and Bochart both inform us, that they come into Egypt in great multitudes, in the spring, at the ripening of the wheat. Bochart, the whole of whose observations upon the nature and history of this bird are extremely curious, derives the name from שלה, *pacate vivere*, and thence *abundare.* They, however, who may wish to see the various meanings of the word שלו accurately detailed, and carefully deduced from the primary sense of the root שלה, will be rewarded by an examination of Schultens's discussion of the signification of the term, in his *Origines Hebrææ*, tom. ii. pp. 52—76. The true meaning of this root is the more important, as from it is supposed by some to be derived the Hebrew word *Shilo*, denoting the Messiah, in the well known prophecy of Jacob.

Of the various translations which have been given of this verse in Job, perhaps that of Dathe conveys the best sense: —

> "Quia venter ejus expleri non poterat,
> Nec quidquam cupiditatibus suis evasit."

Schnurrer, also, has in a like sense rendered this verse, (and,—with the one which immediately precedes, and the one which immediately follows it, all of which have occasioned much perplexity amongst the commentators,—extremely well: —)

> "Quoniam haud sensit quietem in ventre suo,
> Et nihil eorum, quæ appetiit, passus est evadere."

See Schnurrer's *Dissertationes Philologico Criticæ*, p. 256. The same sense has been given by the Vulgate.

The rendering of the Greek is a striking instance of the liberty which that version has so frequently taken with this book. *Οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ σωτηρία τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν*, is the translation of the first clause. I know not well how to account for this rendering, unless by supposing that the Greek interpreters, instead of בבטנו, read in their MS. בביתנו: for it is remarkable, that the word בטנו, which they here render *τὰ ὑπάρχοντα*, they have in the 15th verse rendered *οἰκία*: now, *τὰ ὑπάρχοντα* and *ὅσα ὑπάρχει* they have occasionally used, as well as *οικος*, for בית, as see Gen. xlv. 18; Esth. viii. 1, 7; and in Esth. vii. 8, they translate ביתן by *οἶκος*: therefore it seems not unreasonable to suppose, that they have read the word ביתן here; that is, *th* for *t*, and a י inserted.

It is to be remarked, however, that, amongst the various meanings ascribed to the passage by commentators, there is not one that gives the smallest countenance to the rendering of the word שלו proposed by the Bishop, and on which the whole force of his argument concerning the date of the book depends, (even the pointing of the Masora opposes him:) nor is there one that gives to that word any other sense than that of *quietness, safety, abundance, enjoyment*, all of which spring from the same primary idea; the Syriac only (with its copy the Arabic) excepted; which renders the word by ܕܝܢܗ signifying *his judgment, his condemnation*, or *his punishment:* see Schaaf's *Lex. Syr.* And how to reconcile any of these senses to the original שלו, I confess myself totally at a loss.

[24] May it be permitted, *in transitu*, to ask, what possible meaning can be assigned to these two lines? Is it, that the *waters* are *pierced through*, as well as *the mighty dead?* And do *their inhabitants* mean the *fishes?* And is it meant, that *they* are also *pierced through?* And what is intended by *the waters from beneath?* from beneath *what?* It should be remarked, that, although in the reference to Scott, which is mentioned above, it seems as if the Bishop had adopted these strange phrases in common with that writer, yet the case is not so; they have nothing in common but the meaning of the word רפאים. The Bishop is original, almost throughout the whole verse, especially in the expression of "*the waters from beneath;*" the Hebrew necessarily requiring (as will appear immediately upon inspection) that the word *beneath*, whether it be construed in connection with *the waters* or not, must precede: that is, if the two words are to be combined, it must be "*beneath the waters*," just the opposite of his Lordship's collocation.

The Bishop, in truth, on the word *Rephaim*, is altogether at variance with himself. The phrase "mighty dead," which he here uses for *Rephaim*, is the same which (after Bishop Lowth) he has employed in Isaiah, xiv. 9, for the same Hebrew word. But the explanation of the term which he has there given, he states to have originated with Rosenmüller, (or rather he should have said with Vitringa, for from him Rosenmüller has taken it,) and is altogether different from that which he has here borrowed from Scott. His words *there* are: — "*Rephaim, the gigantic spectres.* Ghosts are commonly magnified by vulgar terror to a stature superior to the human. Rosenm." — Stock's *Isaiah*, p. 40. Thus, then, we find, that *Ghosts*, as such, are magnified by vulgar terror, and may be called *Rephaim*. And so, the appellation, "mighty dead," or *Rephaim*, becomes applicable to *all* the inhabitants of the invisible world. But how then can that, which is represented as a quality of the shades of *all* dead men, namely, gigantic size, or *Rephaism*, be considered in this place as designating the spirits *only of a particular class* of human beings, who, being of *actually* gigantic stature, had lived before the Flood? The two expositions meet, with such adverse fronts, that I despair of being able to reconcile them. "Non nostrum tantas componere lites."

It should not be suffered to pass unnoticed, that in the passage of Job, with which we are at present concerned, there occurs, besides the word רפאים *Rephaim*, another term of considerable moment; to the true nature and meaning of which the Right Rev. translator has by no means paid that attention, which the office assumed by him demanded. The term I allude to is שאול *Sheôl:*[25] a term in whose signification is involved a question no less important than that of the early belief entertained by the people of the East, concerning the existence of the soul after death. With respect to these two important terms, it fortunately happens, that they stand so combined in one part of Scripture as to throw light upon each other, and to leave little

---

[25] It had been well, if the Bishop had attended somewhat more to those learned investigations of the import of this and other difficult terms, which are to be found in Mercer, Schultens, Peters, and the other laborious Commentators, whose cautious researches have only excited his disgust. We should then not find that uncertainty of meaning, which at present attaches to his Lordship's translations of the passages in which such terms occur. The word, in particular, which is here referred to has been rendered by him, in different places, with such variety and such vagueness as to leave the reader altogether ignorant of the sense which the translator conceives most properly to belong to it. Of eight places in which it occurs in the Book of Job, and of ten places in the Prophecy of Isaiah, there is not one, in which the Bishop has taken occasion to give a precise idea of its true signification. Sometimes he calls it "the lower region," (Job, vii. 9; xiv. 13; xxiv. 19)—at others, "hell," (Job, xi. 8; Isai. xiv. 9)—again, "the grave," (Job, xvii. 13, 16; xxi. 13; Isai. v. 14; xiv. 11, 15; xxviii. 15, 18; xxxviii. 10, 18)—again, in the present passage, "the lower world;" and again, (Isai. lvii. 9,) "the lowest pit." Amidst all this variety of application, not a single glance, that I can discover, has been taken at the radical meaning of the word, except in one passing remark, in a criticism, which is of so extraordinary a nature, that I cannot avoid quoting the whole of it, as it stands. It is a note on Job, xx. 9.—"*Which beamed on him.* שזפתו. The reader, who shall take the pains to examine the several Hebrew roots commencing with the letter ש, will be apt to think with me, that the original sense of by far the greatest part of them, may best be discovered, by divesting them of this same initial letter, which stood in the place of an article or preposition merely. Thus שמש, *the sun*, I conceive to be *the feeler*, who feeleth after and investigateth all things: שמים, *the heavens*, the place of *waters*, ש-מים, from which rain, or waters, come; שאול, *the place of the insensible*, Sheôl or Hades. And thus may the verb before us שזף, be traced to זפא, of which we want an example, but it probably signified to *shine*, as from it" (that is, from a non-existing word, observe,) "is derived זפת, *pitch!*" Surely, such another perfect specimen of adventurous criticism the entire regions of conjecture can scarcely supply. In truth, this is such an exercise of the critical faculty, as, were it indulged in, must render the Hebrew Scriptures a perfect nullity, by fastening on them any sense that any guesser might think proper to affix.

That the prefix ש, as an abbreviation for the relative אשר, is not unprecedented, is well known to Hebrew scholars: but, at the same time, this is acknowledged to be a Chaldaism, which, although it is found in the later books of the Old Testament composed about and after the time of the captivity, is denied to have any place in those of earlier production. (See above, p. 154.) What then is to become of all those words beginning with the letter ש, in the several books preceding the captivity, which constitute by much the greater part of the Hebrew Scripture? Are all those words to be interpreted by divesting them of the initial ש, in opposition to the hitherto received opinion, that not more than *two or three* such words at the most are to be found through the entire range of those early writings? Then, indeed, it is time to set about a new translation of the whole body of the Old Tesdoubt remaining upon this most interesting article of Oriental theology. If we look to Isaiah, xiv. 9, we shall there find, what were the Jewish opinions upon this subject in the days of that prophet. I here subjoin the whole passage, as it is rendered by Bishop Lowth.

"Hades (*Sheôl*) from beneath is moved because of thee to meet thee at thy coming:
He rouseth for thee the mighty dead, (*Rephaim*) all the great chiefs of the Earth:
He maketh to rise up from their thrones all the kings of the nations.
All of them shall accost thee, and shall say unto thee:
Art thou, even thou too, become weak as we? Art thou made like unto us?
Is then thy pride brought down to the grave; the sound of thy sprightly instruments?
Is the vermin become thy couch, and the earth-worm thy covering?
How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning?
Art cut down to the earth, thou that didst subdue the nations?"

Thus then, in like manner as Homer, in his *Odyssey*, sends the souls of the slaughtered wooers to *Hades*, where they meet with the manes of Achilles, Agamemnon, and other heroes; so the Hebrew poet, in this passage of inimitable grandeur, describes the king of Babylon, when slain and brought to the grave, as entering *Sheôl*, and there meeting the *Rephaim*, or manes of the dead, who had descended thither before him, and who are poetically represented as rising from their seats at his approach. And as, on the one hand, the passage in the Grecian bard has been always held, without any question, to be demonstrative of the existence of a popular belief amongst the Greeks, that there was a place called *Hades*, which was the receptacle for departed souls; so this poetic image of Isaiah must be allowed, upon the other, to indicate in like manner, amongst the Jews, the existence of a popular belief that there was a region for departed souls called *Sheôl*, in which the *Rephaim* or Manes took up their abode.[26]

---

tament, since so numerous a class of words have hitherto been altogether misunderstood by every interpreter of Scripture. What, in truth, is to become of the Hebrew language? The lexicons at present exhibit, as primitives, not fewer than two hundred words commencing with the letter ש. Now to pronounce, that "by far the greatest part" of these are compounded, and must be divested of that letter in order to discover their true meaning; leaving it also to the conjecture of the individual to determine which words have the prefix, and which not, is surely neither more nor less than to convert the language into mere babble. One would think it scarcely possible to add to the extravagance of this proceeding; and yet has this not been done in the criticism referred to, when, in one of the compounds thus fancifully made up, it is admitted that one of its components has no place in the language? as in the case of ופרח, *to shine*, of which the Bishop says, "we want an example;" and truly says so, there being no such word, in that sense, or in any sense approaching to it, either in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, or in any of the kindred languages, Chaldee, Syriac, or Arabic. But his Lordship adds, that though there *is not*, yet there *ought to be*, such a word, *because* there is such a word as ופרח, *pitch*. If the reader finds it difficult to give credit to this representation, I refer him to the work itself. Or, again, is not the extravagance also heightened, though in an inferior degree, when we find, in the same criticism, a sense given to one of the components, which does not belong to it? as in the word שאול, which, we are told, properly means *the place of the insensible*, being compounded of ש and אול; the latter word of course signifying *insensible*. Now it is notorious, that the word אול bears, throughout the entire Scripture, no other sense than that of *foolish;* which indeed in the Scripture use also implies *wicked;* a meaning, surely, sufficiently removed from that of *insensible;* and the more markedly so, as in the primary sense of the word, it signifies not simply *folly*, but an *activity* in folly.

There is, indeed; it should be noticed, a source for certain Hebrew words commencing with ש, very different from that wild and arbitrary one devised by the Bishop. The *Syriac* has a special conjugation, to which Schultens and Michaelis have given the name of *Schaphel*, from, the prefixed ש being its characteristic, as the ה add הת are the characteristics of the conjugations *Hiphil* and *Hithpahel* in the Hebrew. This is seldom used by the Hebrew in its verbs, but not unfrequently in nouns derived from that conjugation. Here is a legitimate source, and one which in its nature supplies a rule and a limitation. See on this Syriac form, Michaelis, *Not. et Epim.* p. 195.—also Mich. *Gramm. Syr.* p. 91. It should be noted that the *Schaphel* of the Germans should be called *Shaphel* with us; the word being derived from the letter ש, which they write *sch*, and we *sh*.

There is another instance of the application of the new discovery made by the Bishop, respecting words beginning with ש, of a nature so extraordinary, and of which his Lordship has made so extraordinary a use, that I cannot forbear annexing it to this note. On the verb ספק in ch. xxxiv. 26, he remarks in the note: "ספק or שפק, from *unfrequent occurrence*, is not well understood; but if, *according to my rule*, we cast off ש, we shall come to a better known verb, פק, *to stagger*, or to tumble." Now, in the first place (to make no remark on the exercise of *fancy* with respect to the ש, as that is his Lordship's *rule*,) the word which is described as being from unfrequent occurrence not well understood, is found above a dozen times in the Hebrew Bible, and in such connection as to have caused to the commentators no doubt about its meaning; for which it also derives additional confirmation from the kindred languages. And on the other hand, the word פק, (or as he should have written it, פוק,) which his Lordship pronounces to be so much *better known*, occurs only in three places, with the possibility of that sense of *stagger*, in which we are told it is so familiarly understood; and even in those places, the Greek and Latin translators do not concur in giving it that sense: so that, in truth, this word, in the application of it, may be considered as involved in some uncertainty, whilst the one which it is conjured up to supplant is involved in none. But we have not done with this discovery yet. The true sense of ספק or שפק is made out, by his Lordship's *rule*, to signify *stagger* or *tumble;* and, accordingly it is so rendered by him, in the passage to which this note has been attached. But then the same word occurs in four other places in the Book of Job, xx. 22; xvii. 23; xxxiv. 37; xxxvi. 18; and in the three first of these, the idea of *clapping the hands*, which is the true one, and which the Bishop has rejected in the above criticism, is adopted by him; and in the fourth, the vague sense of *exposure* is introduced: whilst the idea of *stagger*, which his Lordship has laboured so much and so unjustifiably to establish as the true and proper sense, is completely forgotten. Surely this is too rambling.

[26] As the above is a point of considerable moment, and vitally connected with a subject which has excited much controversy and great interest, I must add a few more observations upon the meaning of the two remarkable words with which we are here concerned. And, in the first instance, the reader may not be

The next passage to which the Bishop has referred us, (see p. 133,) is found in chap. xxxiv. 20, which in our common version stands thus: "In a moment shall they die, and the people shall be troubled at midnight, and pass away; and the mighty shall be taken

displeased with a compressed statement of what the very learned Vitringa has given at length upon this head. After admitting, in his remarks on the passage of Isaiah just cited, that the word *Sheôl* may be (though it very rarely is) applied in the sense of *grave* or *sepulchre*, he proceeds to argue, that in this sense it cannot have been employed in the passage under discussion; for that it would be a monstrous abuse of language, to say that the grave stirred up those who were actually dead: and therefore he contends, that the whole passage must be explained, as a poetic fiction, accommodated to the existing opinions of the day, which he holds to have been these: — That the souls of men, when released from the body by death, pass into a vast subterraneous region, as a common receptacle, but with different mansions, adapted to the different qualities of its inhabitants; and that here, preserving the shades and resemblances of the living, they fill the same characters they did in life. That this entire region was called by the Jews *Sheôl*, by the Greeks *Hades*, and by the Latins *Inferi*. That these were the notions that commonly prevailed amongst the Jews, he conceives to be fully established by various parts of Scripture; and to this, he thinks, the history of the witch of Endor yields confirmation, inasmuch as, let the illusion in that transaction be what it might, it goes to establish the fact of the opinion which was then vulgarly received. Agreeably to this hypothesis, he contends that various expressions of the patriarchs and prophets are to be explained; and to this purpose he instances Gen. xxxvii. 35; Psalm xvi. 10; xxx. 4; xciv. 17; in all of which, a place where souls, when freed from the body, were assembled, still preserving all their faculties, is, as he thinks, plainly supposed. From the Hebrews he conceives that this opinion passed to other people, and became disfigured by various fictions of their respective invention. Thus the doctrine of the Egyptians respecting *Hades* is given in the second book of Herodotus; where we have the history of Rhampsinitus, who, according to the traditions of the Egyptians, had visited the infernal regions, and returned safe to life. The notion, he says, was variously embellished by the Greek poets; and afterwards, being stripped by Plato of much of its poetic ornaments, was embodied by him in his philosophical system. Hence, again, the Latins, and the nations at large, derived their phraseology in speaking of the state of the dead; for instances of which phraseology he refers to Velleius, Livy, Florus, and others.

The learned writer then proceeds to the *Rephaim*, who are here described by Isaiah, as raised from their seats by *Sheôl*, on the approach of the King of Babylon; and who must consequently be the shades or manes by which *Sheôl* is inhabited. But wherefore denominated *Rephaim?* By this word, he says, it appears indisputably from Isaiah, xxiv. 14, compared with this passage, must be meant the souls of the deceased. But at the same time, he observes, it appears no less indisputably from Gen. xiv. 5, and Deut. iii. 11, that the same word is employed to designate a people of gigantic stature among the Canaanites; and it is accordingly almost every where rendered "giants" by the LXX and Vulgate. How to reconcile these two senses, which appear so very different, has been a difficulty with commentators. But this difficulty, he says, will be removed, if we attend to the notion which has vulgarly prevailed concerning ghosts or manes; that they appear of a stature greater than human: and hence our author thinks, that the word which originally denoted the shades of the departed, came to be transferred to denote men of a gigantic bulk; and so became finally an appellation for both. See Vitringa in Isa. tom. i. pp. 432, 433.

I find that Cocceius explains the application of the term *Rephaim* to the giants in Canaan, on the same principle, though not so explicitly, as Vitringa. His words are, "possit videri, eos" (gigantes, scil.) "ita appellatos, quod tanquam manes et spectra inter homines versarentur." The word itself he derives originally from רפה, *resolvere;* or as the LXX *παραλύεσθαι*, *ἐκλύεσθαι*; and its primary meaning he considers to be "resoluti mortui in pulverem redacti"—hence *manes*. Michaelis has, in a way that appears not equally satisfactory, endeavoured to account for the application of the same term *Rephaim* to giants and ghosts, on the idea of the dark caverns inhabited by the former. — See *Not. et Epim.* pp. 28, 29.

The very learned and ingenious examination of the terms *Sheôl* and *Rephaim*, by Peters, (from p. 318, to 382,) merits particular attention. *Sheôl* he distinguishes into two parts, the upper and the lower, in the latter of which he places the residence of the wicked spirits; and to this class he applies the term *Rephaim*, as being giants in impiety. In this point, however, I apprehend he has carried the matter too far; for the giants in impiety to whom he primarily alludes, are those monstrous defiers of God's authority who lived before the Flood, and were overwhelmed by the Almighty for their enormous wickedness: and from these it is that he transfers the term *Rephaim*, to the shades of all such as had been mighty in violence and crimes. But in doing this, he has fallen into the same error which I have noticed in Bishop Stock and others; namely, that of supposing *Rephaim* to have been the name of those heaven-defying giants that lived before the Flood; whereas, as was shewn in p. 162, they had no such name; being known only by that of *Nephilim*. Peters, indeed, appears to me also to have followed the clue of interpretation, with respect to the term *Rephaim*, in a wrong direction altogether, by transferring the word from the primary signification of *giants* to the secondary one of *shades;* whereas I have little doubt that it was first the proper appellation of the latter, and thence extended to the former, in the manner suggested by Vitringa. At the same time I agree with Peters and with Schultens, that the word is sometimes taken in an unfavourable sense, so as to particularize the souls of the wicked. This, I think, is manifest from Prov. ix. 18; xxi. 16. And I would in the following manner explain the various acceptations of the word, which I have not been able to find has yet been satisfactorily done by any author.

From the verb רפה, signifying *resolvere*, I derive, with Cocceius, the word רפאים, *resoluti;* which, applied to human beings, denotes that they are reduced to their first elements by dissolution. *Rephaim*, therefore, implies the *deceased*, in that separated condition of the component parts of their nature which is produced by death: and as the bodily part moulders into dust and becomes insensible, it is consequently applied to that active principle, which retains the consciousness, and continues, as it were, the existence of the man. *Rephaim*, then, imports men in that state to which they are brought, when reduced by dissolution to the simple and essential element, the soul; and thence has been used to signify the *ghosts of the deceased*. These, again, being clothed by the imaginations of the living in certain airy shapes, and magnified through terror to gigantic stature, in process of time lent their name to men of great and terrific bulk; and hence the appellation passed to giants, and became the denomination of certain classes of that description in Canaan. Again, these *Rephaim* of the Canaanites, being distinguished amongst a people who were all odious for their crimes, and as such pronounced to be an abomination to the Lord, the idea of great wickedness, so strongly associated with the name, was by degrees reflected back upon the primitive term; so that *Rephaim*, as applied to the souls of the dead, came at length to imply also specially the souls of the guilty dead. Thus *Rephaim* becomes properly capable of these three senses, *Ghosts*, *Giants*, and *Ghosts of the wicked*.

Again, as to the origin of the word שאול *Sheôl*, signifying, as we have seen, the region allotted to the residence of the *Rephaim*, or shades of the departed, it has been best derived from the verb שאל, *quæsivit, postulavit*, indicating its insatiable craving; a character which we find particularly attached to it in several parts of Scripture—see Isai. v. 14; Ḥabak. ii. 5; Prov. xxvii. 20; xxx. 16. At the same time I confess, I cannot but think, that there has been overlooked by the Critics a particular acceptation of the word שאל, which would more adequately convey the true character and nature of *Sheôl*. The verb is known not only to signify, to *demand*, or *crave*, but to *demand*, or *crave as a loan;* and therefore implies that what is sought for is to be *rendered back*. In this view of the case, *Sheôl* is to be understood, not simply as the region of departed away without hand." On this passage his Lordship makes the following observations,—"The sudden death here described, its happening at midnight, the trepidation of the people, the removal of the strong ones to the other world by an invisible hand; what are all these but the circumstances recorded by Moses in Exodus, xii. 29, of the destruction of the first-born of the Egyptians? Pharaoh likewise is the king, to whom God is said just before to have given the title of Belial. We have here of course another proof, that the writer of this poem was posterior in time to Moses."[27]

Now, undoubtedly, if this supplies a proof of the point proposed, the matter of demonstration is easier than has been commonly imagined. In the original passage here referred to, it must be remembered, that the Bishop does not pretend to have discovered any one expression, which is to be found in the description of the slaughter of the first-born in Egypt, excepting the single term, *midnight.* This almost total diversity of phrase is surely no part of the proof that the description in Job is taken from that which was given by Moses. But although there be not an identity of expressions, yet may there not be a general similarity to justify the Bishop's assertion? On the contrary, there is nothing more requisite than his Lordship's own statement of the case to overturn every idea of a reference to Moses's account of the above transaction. For, in the first place, according to that statement, God is here represented as having given to Pharaoh the title of Belial.[28] Now this is a piece of information, with which Moses does not appear to have been acquainted; of which at least he has left behind him no record.

---

spirits, but as the region which is to form their *temporary* residence, and from which they are at some future time to be rendered up; thus indicating an intermediate state of the soul, between its departure from this world, and some future stage of its existence. This particular acceptation of the word receives countenance in this passage of Job, especially from the rendering of the LXX and the Chaldee, with which our common version corresponds. The word יתוללו, the former renders by *μαιωθήσονται*, (from *μαία*, *obstetrix*,) *shall be brought forth;* and the latter by a word signifying *regenerabuntur — shall be born again:* both evidently explaining the Hebrew word חלל or חול, in reference to the *pains of bringing forth;* and signifying, that the *Rephaim* were to be rendered up from the place of their residence, and, as it were, born again into some new state of existence. Codurcus also, I find, in his explanation of *Sheôl*, describes the notion entertained of it by the Jews thus: "שאול, purgatorii locum existimant, ex quo redduntur superis animæ, exantlatis quibus erant obnoxiæ pœnis." (*Crit. Sacr.* tom. iii. p. 3318.) Windet also mentions, that to the *Sheôl* of the Hebrews, corresponds the *Amenthes* of the Egyptians, which Plutarch, comparing it with the *Hades* of the Greeks, expounds by *τὸν λαμϐάνοντα καὶ δίδοντα*, in his book of Isis and Osiris. (*De vitâ functorum statu*, p. 24; also Peters, p. 320.) Windet likewise informs us, that the Jews hold *Gehenna*, or the place of perdition, to be the lowest part of *Sheôl*, the general receptacle of departed souls: and that in order to express the great depth, to which they conceive it to be sunk, they are used to describe it as *beneath the waters:* their idea being, that the waters are placed below the earth, and that the earth floats upon them like a ship. (*De vita functorum statu*, pp. 242, 243.) *Tartarus*, in like manner, he says, (p. 245,) the Greeks made the lowest part of *Hades*.

On the Jewish notions of *Sheôl*, compared with the Greek notions of *Hades*, I would refer the reader to the entire of the last-named work; to Peters's *Crit. Diss.* as before noticed; to Bishop Lowth's *Lectures*, vol. i. pp. 156—166. (Greg. edit.) and Mr Henley's note in ditto, p. 213; to Mich. *Not. et Epim.* pp. 27, 28; and to Bishop Horsley's Hosea, pp. 46, 157—160, 200, 201. He may consult also with advantage the Sermon of this last writer, upon Christ's descent into Sheôl: and upon the same subject he will find a good discourse by Johnson of Cranbrook, in the second volume of his *Sermons*.

Were I now, upon the whole, to offer my own rendering of the passage in Job out of which this long discussion has arisen, I would venture the following:—

The souls of the dead tremble;
[The places] below the waters, and their inhabitants.
The seat of spirits is naked before him;
And the region of destruction hath no covering.

Here I take the "souls of the dead," and the "inhabitants of the places below the (abyss of) waters," to bear to each other the same proportion, that is found, in the next verse, to subsist between the "seat of spirits," and the "region of destruction:" those of the dead who were sunk in the lowest parts of Sheôl being placed in the "region of destruction," or the *Gehenna* of the later Jews. So that the passage, on the whole, conveys this,—that nothing is, or can be concealed from the all-seeing eye of God; that the souls of the dead tremble under his view, and the shades of the wicked, sunk to the bottom of the abyss, can even there find no covering from his sight.

[27] Heath, who is extremely anxious to lower the antiquity of the Book of Job, has gone before the Bishop, in the notion that the slaughter of the first-born is here alluded to; although his Lordship has mentioned this, as one of the notes of time, which had escaped all the commentators. To make the reference appear more probable, that author has rendered the word יעברו, in such a manner, as to imply the *passing* on of the destroying angel, as described by Moses. In doing so, he has undoubtedly improved the resemblance to the account of the transaction in Exodus. But to make this point out, he is compelled either to violate grammar, or to pluralize the angel. These things, however, avail nothing, as the hypothesis must be supported. Warburton, with the same resolute determination to modernize Job, discovers, in the passage before us, not only the transaction in Egypt, but also another of a nature entirely different. The words, he says, "plainly refer to the destruction of the first-born in Egypt, and Sennacherib's army ravaging Judea."—*Div. Leg.* vol. ii. p. 498. What now becomes of that appropriate term, "midnight," which, with the Bishop, singled out the transaction in Egypt from every other; and of that other significant word, יעברו, "pass through," which has so completely satisfied Heath, that no other than that transaction could have been intended,—neither of these words being found in the history of the destruction of Sennacherib's army? Codurcus has, with true propriety and good sense, suggested the use which is to be made of the two events alluded to by Warburton; namely, that they are facts, to which the mind is naturally led, as tending to exemplify and confirm the observation on the ways of Providence, which is laid down in this part of Job; and that had these events taken place before the composition of the poem, it would not be unnatural to suppose that the writer had them, with others of the same kind, in his view. These are the reflections of a sober judgment, which, it were much to be wished, was more frequently to be met with in our commentators and translators. I should mention, indeed, that Holden and Scott have taken the same judicious view of the subject. To prove how wide in its application this passage in Job has been found, I shall add only one instance more of its appropriation. The Chaldee has discovered in it an allusion to "the destruction of Sodom."

[28] His Lordship has here created a difficulty against himself. For, as was stated above, were Pharaoh supposed to be in this place intended under the title of *Belial*, this would disprove the Bishop's position, that the writer alludes to the history in

Again, as his Lordship reminds us, and with the additional emphasis of italics, the passage in Job describes those who were taken away, as "*the strong ones*." Now what does Moses tell us? That, "the Lord smote *all* the first-born in the land of Egypt, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sat on his throne, unto the first-born of the captive that was in the dungeon; and all the first-born of the cattle." In other words, he informs us, that the first-born, of both man and beast, was indiscriminately destroyed; and this, the Bishop thinks, is significantly conveyed by the phrase *strong ones*, or rather (as our common version more properly reads) the *mighty*. But, again, his Lordship sees plainly in "the invisible hand," (or, as he himself renders it, and as it ought to be rendered, *without hand*,) a marked proof of the allusion in this part of Job to Moses. To this it may safely be replied, that the proof is as invisible as the hand; for nothing corresponding to this phrase is to be found in the language of Moses.

In short, if one were seeking arguments to prove that the writer of the Book of Job had not, in this place, his eye fixed upon the record of the transaction in Egypt which has been left by Moses, he would naturally select most of those very circumstances on which the Bishop seems so firmly to rely. For it must be remembered, that his Lordship is not content to say, that the writer of the Book of Job refers to facts, which are related also by Moses; but he contends, particularly, that he must have derived his knowledge of those facts from the very accounts which Moses had given of them in his writings:—facts, he observes, not being usually referred to before the history recording them has had time to obtain currency; and the author of Job being, consequently, indebted to the history of Moses for his knowledge of such facts as have been adverted to by both. See p. 154.

But, in truth, not only is it manifest, that the writer of Job has not, in the passage before us, referred to the Mosaic account of the destruction of the first-born in Egypt, but there appears no reasonable ground for supposing that he meant to allude to that transaction at all. This will be best seen by a perusal of the entire passage in Job, as it is given in the common version, and here subjoined.[29]

Exodus. But that Pharaoh is intended here, there is not the slightest ground to imagine. In this I will be judged even by the Bishop's own translation:

> "Shall even the hater of justice give laws?
> And wilt thou condemn the eminently just One?
> Who saith unto a king, Thou art Belial!
> Ye are wicked! unto princes:
> Who accepteth not the persons of nobles,
> Neither is the rich man," &c.

Now where is Pharaoh? Is it in the word Belial? That name was never given to him. But he deserved such a name. Why? Is it because Belial implies wickedness? and was Pharaoh the only wicked king? We might also demand to be informed who were those "Princes of Pharaoh's court," who are at the same time denominated *wicked*. In truth, the Bishop's argument might, on the whole, be put thus: Pharaoh, it is true, is not by Moses called Belial, but he ought to have been so called by him, and therefore we may consider him as actually having been so called. Again; Pharaoh is not named here, but as the word Belial is used, which denotes wickedness, Pharaoh ought to have been named, and therefore we may consider him as having been actually named. Really this is too extravagant.—N.B. The word בליעל *Belial*, simply signifies *worthless*, *wicked*, *ἀχρεῖος*, *nequam*: from בל *non*, and יעל *profuit*.

[29] "Shall even he that hateth right govern?
And wilt thou condemn him that is most just?
Is it fit to say to a King, *Thou art* wicked?
And to Princes, *Ye are* ungodly?
How much less to him that accepteth not the persons of princes,
Nor regardeth the rich more than the poor?
For they are all the work of his hands.
In a moment shall they die;
And the people shall be troubled at midnight, and pass away,
And the mighty shall be taken away without hand.
For his eyes are upon the ways of man,
And he seeth all his goings.
There is no darkness nor shadow of death,
Where the workers of iniquity may hide themselves.
For he will not lay upon man more *than right;*
That he should enter into judgment with God.
He shall break in pieces mighty men without number,
And set others in their stead.
Therefore he knoweth their works,
And he overturneth them in the night,
So that they are destroyed.
He striketh them as wicked men,
In the open sight of others:
Because they turned back from him,
And would not consider any of his ways.
So that they cause the cry of the poor to come unto him;
And he heareth the cry of the afflicted."

I cannot deny myself the pleasure of introducing, in this place, to the reader's acquaintance, a translator of the Book of Job, in the person of a young lady; who, adorned with all the accomplishments which distinguish her own sex, devoted herself, at the age of fifteen, to studies the most serious and intense, that are accustomed to occupy the attention of the other: and this, with such surprising success, that although self-taught, and nearly deprived of the benefit of books, she left behind her, at the expiration of her twenty-ninth year, a numerous collection of writings, so various and so valuable, as may well make many a literary man look back with a blush upon the labours of a lengthened life. See *Fragments in Prose and Verse, by a young Lady.*

Miss Smith's translation of the Book of Job, for which she had qualified herself by a close study of the Arabic and Hebrew, was completed before her twenty-sixth year, two years earlier than the date of the translation by the Bishop of Killala. It is at this time well known to the public, by a neat edition of the work, which has, since the date of the above observations, been given by Dr Randolph, who has enhanced its value by a variety of judicious critical observations. I annex this lady's version of the passage above referred to, as it may be to many a matter of curiosity to compare with our received translation any part of so extraordinary a production.

> Shall he who hateth right govern?
> And wilt thou condemn him, who aboundeth in justice?
> Who saith to the King, Thou art unprofitable;
> Wicked, to the Nobles:
> Who lifteth not up the faces of Princes,
> Nor turneth away from the cry of the Poor,
> For they are all the work of his hands.
> In a moment they shall die;
> At midnight the people shall tremble, and pass away,
> And the mighty shall be removed without hand.

Now what is there here, to lead us to the destruction of the first-born in Egypt? Surely, if this were intended, some of the many extraordinary circumstances of so extraordinary a transaction would have been glanced at — the slaying of the lamb — the blood sprinkled upon the door-posts—the destroying angel—the preservation of the Hebrews, &c. On the contrary, the great power and impartial justice of God, in visiting, with sudden destruction, all, whether people or princes, whose crimes demand vengeance, seems to be the main thing insisted upon, without any discriminating characters to bind down this judicial exercise of his power to any one particular event. As to the circumstance of the destruction being wrought "at midnight," or, as it is again more generally stated, "in the night," it seems to connect with the idea, that "the workers of iniquity" could, as they imagined, "hide themselves," in the "darkness" and privacy of the night. Grey and Schultens, accordingly, explain the phrase of *night* or *midnight*, "in securitate profundissimâ." The paraphrase of Calvin upon this passage seems to give the justest notion of it. "Non opus erit, ut Deus multos milites armet, &c. ad potentissimos et robustissimos evertendos: si modo insufflet, parvi et magni, puncto temporis, rapientur, et mediâ nocte quum omnes quiescunt atque nihil minus expectant, exterminabuntur; sine manu hominis auxiliove; quin sine conatu aut molimine ullo." Spanheim, in his *History of Job*, gives the same explanation. Munster, Vatablus, Clarius, Drusius, Patrick, Holden, Scott, and Dathe, likewise concur in this view of the case. Upon the whole it must be clear to every unprejudiced reader, that nothing but the creative eye of an hypothesis could have discovered, in this passage of Job, the appropriate mark of time which the Bishop and Heath have descried in it.

We pass on, then, to the next and only remaining allusion to the books of Moses; which, his lordship informs us, is to be found in chap. xxxi. 33, compared with Gen. iii. 8, 12. The words in Job are, "If I covered my transgressions, as Adam, by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom." Now, independently of the probability, that the general outline of the story of Adam's transgression had been handed down so as to be generally known to those who lived near the patriarchal age, — it must be observed, that this translation is by no means generally acquiesced in, either by the ancient or by the modern interpreters of Job. The Arabic and Syriac render the phrase כאדם, generally, "as men." The LXX render, or rather paraphrase it, ἀκουσίως, "involuntarily," or through the infirmity which belongs to man:[30]—the Vulgate, "quasi homo,"

For his eyes are on the ways of man,
And he seeth all his steps.

There is no darkness, and no shade of death,
To conceal the workers of iniquity.

For on no man hath it yet been put,
To walk with God in judgment.

He breaketh the mighty — they cannot be found;
And setteth up others in their stead.

Because he knoweth their works,
They are overturned in the night — they are crushed.

He striketh them like culprits,
In the place of beholders.

Because they turned from behind him,
And would not follow all his ways.

Bringing before him the cry of the poor;
And he heard the cry of the oppressed.

On a comparison with the original, this will be found more faithful in many parts than the received version. Particularly, in that very difficult passage in the 18th and 19th verses, in which the latter demands so large an ellipsis as is found in italics in the common Bible, our fair translator has, by a close adherence to the original, given excellent sense to the whole. She was not aware that she coincided with high authorities in giving this turn to the original. (See Schnurrer, *Dissert. Phil.* p. 279.) "Illum, qui regem adeo compellat hominem nequam; viros primarios, improbos? Non respicit principes," &c. &c. The LXX and Vulg. render it in like manner "qui dicit;" and one MS. of De Rossi's reads האמר, fixing it in this sense. The 23d verse, too, — the difficulty of which is so great, that Schultens has reckoned up nineteen different meanings assigned to it, whilst Schnurrer has added several others, (p. 280,) — in which also our common version makes out the sense by an ellipsis, and Bishop Stock, by introducing a change in the original text, (supposing עוד to be put for עול) — we have, here, rendered naturally as to the context, and simply and accurately as to the original, without supposing any change in the text, or putting any force upon the words. The sense of the entire passage may, agreeably to this translation, be now thus unfolded: — The wicked are at once and suddenly punished; inasmuch as no darkness can conceal them from the all-seeing eye; and as it has not been allotted to man to enter into judgment, and discuss the right of the case with his God, so, without the delay of any judicial process, he breaketh the mighty at once, because without any such form of judicial discussion "he knoweth their works," &c. A marginal reading on the 24th verse in the common Bible goes to strengthen this interpretation, "without searching out," exactly expressing the absence of that formal and inquisitorial examination which the omniscience of the Deity renders unnecessary. Perhaps Miss Smith meant this by the words "no search," which she has added as another rendering for that which she has paraphrased by the expression, "they cannot be found."

There is another line in the above extract from this lady's version which deserves to be noticed. "Nor turneth away from the cry of the poor," (verse 19.) Here the word שוע, which in the common translation is rendered "the rich," has been taken in its ordinary and familiar acceptation, "cry;" and I find that Pagninus, in his version of the passage, has used it in the same sense. To render the original exactly, then, according to this meaning of the term, it would be, "Nor turneth away from the cry at the face of the poor." "The cry *at the face of* the poor," for "the cry *of* the poor," certainly appears a harsh construction, but yet is not irreconcileable with the Hebrew idiom. The parallelism in the 19th verse is undoubtedly better preserved by this translation than by the common one: the poor in the second line being contrasted with the princes in the first; whereas, in the usual way of rendering, (שוע being taken to signify the rich,) the same description of persons that are spoken of in the first line are again introduced into the second, so as to disturb the simplicity of the contrast, bv naming twice over one of the subjects of the opposition.

[30] See p. 91 for this sense of ἀκουσίως, as used by the LXX. See also, in addition to what is there said, the remarks of Fischer in his *Clavis Reliquiarum Versionum Græcarum*, &c. pp. 219—222; Velthusen, *Comment. Theol*, tom. iv.

—Pagninus, in like manner, "ut homo,"—J. Tr. and Pisc. "more hominum,"—Mercer, "sicut homines,"—Tindal, "before men,"—Dathe, "more humano," and subjoins to his translation the following remark: "Many interpreters think that אדם is here the proper name of the first man. But since, in the whole Book of Job, there is no one evident allusion to the sacred history, I rather agree with those, who render the word כאדם, 'as men,' 'after the manner of men.'"[31]

I have enumerated these opinions, not because I think that the common version "As Adam," ought to be rejected, but for the purpose of shewing how little reason there is for pronouncing with confidence,—so as to build upon it any argument as to the time of the writer,—that such must be the sense. It is remarkable that all the early interpreters render the word otherwise. At the same time I cannot but confess that it appears to me to be a natural and just translation. And I will add, that there is introduced in the same verse, another expression, on which the bishop, had he noticed it, might have laid some stress in furtherance of the argument he has advanced. בחבי[32] has for its root חבא, the same that is used in Gen. iii. 8, 10, to describe the hiding of our first parents from the presence of God. But yet, even this must be admitted to form a very slight ground of inference, in supposing the passage in Genesis to have been referred to by the writer of Job; especially when it is considered, that the idea of hiding or concealing, is conveyed, in the same verse, in two other words, כסה and טמן; so that when the same idea was again to be expressed, some third term would naturally be employed. Besides, independently of this consideration, the mere use of so common a word, and one which has been so frequently employed throughout the poem, could of itself prove nothing.

---

[31] Miss Smith's translation of the word has run into a freedom which seems not justified by the original—"as a *mean* man." For this no authority is adduced. The word אדם is undoubtedly to be rendered in this sense in Isa. ii. 9. But Vitringa well remarks upon that place, that when the words איש and אדם occur contrasted in the same sentence, the former signifies a man of dignity and note, the other a person of meaner condition. There is no passage, I believe, in the Old Testament, in which, without such a contrast implied in the sentence, the word is confined to the import which has here been given to it by Miss Smith.

[32] This is commonly rendered "in my bosom." I am convinced that it should be rendered "in my lurking-place," and that the whole verse should be thus translated:—

"Did I cover, like Adam, my transgression,
By hiding, in my lurking-place, mine iniquity."

I agree also with Peters, (pref. p. viii.) that this contains a reference to the history of the first man, and his endeavours to hide himself after his transgression. But when he joins with these words, and as part of the same sentence, "because I feared a great multitude, or the contempt of families terrified me," I think he joins together incongruous ideas; for Job would in no degree have resembled Adam in hiding his transgression, had it been done through the fear of men, and to avoid the contempt of families, there being none such for Adam to fear. So that I cannot but wonder that so perspicacious a writer could have been led into such confusion. The Bishop of Killalla, in his translation, has fallen into the same mistake. Miss Smith has marked the true spirit of the connection,—"Then let me be terrified," &c.

The translation of the following verse, as it has been given by the bishop, I cannot avoid annexing, on account of a singularity in the version which I believe is scarcely to be paralleled.

"Because I dreaded the great multitude,
And the *buz* of families scared me," &c.

I need not say that the word *buz* is peculiar to this version. The original expression signifies simply and plainly *contempt*, and is so rendered by all. Why then *buz?* The reader will be surprised to learn that this is the very word in Hebrew put into the English character; בוז, *buz*. This translation is certainly literal in the most literal sense of the word. But is it not too much to pursue such exactness, so as to allow the meaning altogether to escape?

This is not the only instance afforded us by the bishop, of this new species of literal translation, which is effected merely by an alteration of the character in which the original word is written, and so giving a Hebrew word in an English type. Another striking one is supplied in ch. iv. 10, and repeated in ch. x. 16; xxviii. 8, in all which places we find the word שחל, *Shachal*, which has been by other interpeters rendered a *lion*, conveyed to us by the bishop under the term *jackal*—a change of the sense for which no conceivable reason can be assigned but the sameness of sound, the word *jackal*, or *schakal*, (the name being thus indifferently written by English zoologists, from the French *chacal*,) coinciding exactly with the Hebrew. It is not, indeed, without reason that the word שועל, *shoghal*, has been considered as denoting that species of fox which is called the *jackal*, as may be seen in Parkhurst, who has some good observations on the word; and as it is used by Geddes in his translation of Judges, xv. 4, concerning the foxes said to be caught by Samson. But שחל, the word with which we are concerned, has, I am confident, never been so rendered by any writer but Bishop Stock; and in using the word *jackal*, in the several passages above mentioned, the English reader will be immediately aware, on the bare perusal, how miserably the sense is degraded. But still more so will he find it in those other parts of Scripture where this word is to be met with, viz. Psal. xci. 13; Prov. xxvi. 13; Hos. v. 14; xiii. 7;—in all of which a fierce and powerful animal is manifestly intended. When the slothful man through pretended terror is made to exclaim, "There is a *lion* in the way;" what will be thought of the change that makes him cry out, "There is a *jackal* in the way?"

Bishop Pocock and Primate Newcome have both justly remarked on the word שחל in Hos. v. 14, that it undoubtedly signifies a *species of lion;* and the latter has well explained the word in agreement with Bochart, "שחל, *Leo niger*, for שחר; the ל and ר being often exchanged in the Eastern languages." [N.B. On the first of the three texts in Job above cited, there is a judicious criticism made by Pilkington (in his *Remarks*, p. 183) with respect to the true pointing of the place, which I have not seen noticed by any translator of Job, and which ought not to be overlooked.]

Having noticed Bishop Stock's treatment of that noble animal the *lion*, in reducing him (under the term שחל) to the low estate of the *jackal*, I cannot avoid adverting to another attack made by him upon the same animal, (under the term שחצה,) in the third of the texts already referred to. In the common version of Job, xxviii. 8, we have, "the *lion's whelps* have not trodden it, nor the *fierce lion* passed by it." In the bishop's rendering, "The *sons of the splitter* tread it not, neither passeth over it the *jackal.*" Will not the reader exclaim, "Hyperion to a Satyr!" But now, to discover what is meant by "sons of the splitter," or how such an expression could come to be substituted for "the lion's whelps," must surely be left to Œdipus himself, did not his lordship step in to relieve us from our difficulty, by a translation of his translation, in the following note: "*The splitter.*] The lion, who *splitteth* his prey in sunder." His lordship then proceeds to explain how the word comes to signify the *splitter*, The word שחצה, he writes ש־חצה, *who splitteth;* and so, he observes, we have another instance of the mode of tracing the meaning of words that commence with ש;—a mode to which I have already directed the reader's attention in the note p. 163. To the instances there enumerated of the application of this strange and fanciful rule, he will be pleased to annex this new specimen of its use, which has changed "the whelps of the lion" into "the sons of the splitter!" N.B. "The daughters of screeching" (Stock's Job, xxx. 29) seem fit companions for these "sons of the splitter."

We have now seen the full amount of the proofs by which the Bishop of Killalla persuades himself that he has established the priority of the writings of Moses to the Book of Job. And whether those "notes of time," which (he adds) "have escaped the diligence of all preceding[33] critics," be sufficient to justify the inference so confidently drawn, "that the writer of Job was junior to the Jewish legislator," must be left to the reader to decide.

Indeed, were the utmost that the bishop desires conceded to his arguments; even allowing his lordship's flight of quails, and the destruction of the first-born in Egypt, to hold good; the poem would not thereby, of necessity, be brought lower than the time of Moses; but might still, consistently with this admission, have been composed during the sojourning of the Israelites in the wilderness; which (it should be observed) is one branch of the hypothesis which supports the antiquity of the poem. See above, page 157. And yet his lordship is not content with inferring from the fore-mentioned supposed allusions, that the writer of Job was junior to Moses, but would also deduce from them the likelihood of his having been "junior by some time." But since *the quail* cannot be maintained; since the mere word *night*, or *midnight*, is insufficient to designate the destruction of the first-born in Egypt; since the facts of the existence of giants before the Flood (even supposing such to have been intended by the *Rephaim* of Job,) and of Adam's transgression and his endeavour to conceal it (supposing these also to have been alluded to,) must have been known even to the latest date of the patriarchal age by tradition:[34] it seems plainly to follow, that the "sandy foundation," on which the bishop conceives the opinion of the antiquity of this poem to be built, belongs rather to another structure, which his lordship has, by his own confession, a little too hastily thrown up.

On the three remaining marks of time it cannot be necessary to dwell. The reader will be easily satisfied upon the bare perusal of the passages referred to, even in the bishop's own translation of them, that they contain no indications whatever of that reduced date which he ascribes to this book. The inference from ch. xxxiii. 23,[35] which would bring it down to the time of David, is, as may be seen in the note below, too shadowy to bear the touch: and the supposed allusions to events belonging to the age of the captivity, in chapters xxi. and xxxvi. the bishop himself admits to be so faint as not to be very confidently relied on. And yet, strange to say, after making this admission, and consequently relinquishing the only pretence that existed for reducing the poem lower than the age of David, he yet speaks of these very passages, as "adding strength to the sentiment of those learned men, who have been inclined to give the honour of this celebrated composition to Ezra." That is, he abandons the premises, and at the same time holds to the conclusion: —and this, too, a conclusion, which the most ingenious critics, who have ever undertaken its support, have failed in their endeavours to maintain.

---

[33] Of the four "notes of time" that have been discussed, there is but one (that which is founded on the bishop's novel translation, *quails*) that has not been again and again adverted to, by different writers, as supplying some ground for questioning the antiquity of the Book of Job, and as often either abandoned or confuted. The same is to be said of the other notes of time which his lordship has advanced, with the exception of that one which relates to the history of David, on which more hereafter. The assertion, however, which his lordship has made as to these notes of time having escaped the diligence of preceding critics, is easily explained by the statement which accompanies it, namely, that his lordship declined the trouble of acquainting himself with what preceding critics had written. This offers, at the same time, no very satisfactory justification of the fact of old wares being put forward for new. The general reader would naturally, from his lordship's language, have inferred, that new proofs were now adduced of the lateness of Job, and, from faith in his lordship's authority, might imagine that these proofs were more potent than any that had gone before; but he would little expect to find in them nothing but the shreds and refuse of former hackneyed criticisms and exploded conjectures.

[34] The great distance of time from Adam creates no difficulty respecting Job's knowledge of the transaction of the Fall. It should be remembered that the patriarchal longevity diminishes the effect of that distance. In fact, we can connect Adam and Abraham by two intervening links, Methuselah and Shem: Methuselah connecting Adam and Shem, as having lived concurrently with part of the lives of both; and Shem again, in like manner, connecting Methuselah and Abraham. The history need then have passed but through three steps to reach Abraham from Adam, and so would naturally spread through the several branches of the Abrahamic family; from which, and not remotely, the three friends of Job, and Job himself, are supposed to have been descended.

Blair gives the lives of the four patriarchs above named, so as to make it appear that Methuselah was 253 years old at the death of Adam; Shem, 97 years old at the death of Methuselah; and Abraham, 150 years old at the death of Shem.

[35] It is whimsical enough, that the writers who are desirous to reduce the antiquity of the Book of Job discover, in the same passages, resemblances to events entirely different. Bishop Stock sees *clearly*, in the above passage, an allusion to the destroying and interceding angels in the time of David, described in 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, and 1 Chron. xxi .15. Warburton discerns in it "*a most circumstantial account* of God's dealing with Hezekiah, as it is told in the Books of Chronicles and Kings," (*Div. Leg.* vol. ii. p. 497.) And Heath, again, pronounces of it, that it "*so plainly* describes the case of Hezekiah, when he fell sick, and the prophet Isaiah came to him with messages from God, that it is *hardly possible to apply it otherwise*." That the application so strenuously contended for by the two last writers is altogether inadmissible, has been decisively shewn by Peters, in his *Crit. Diss.* pp. 35, 36. Were objects of allusion to be curiously sought after among the events recorded in sacred history, the intended sacrifice of Isaac might perhaps be thought an object of reference not less likely than any that has been assigned. But, in truth, of all that have been suggested by any supposed resemblance, none has been more unhappily selected than that which the bishop has imagined, and in which I verily believe he has not been anticipated by any preceding critic. The perusal of the passage in Job, and of the history to which his lordship refers, will be at once sufficient to prove, not only that they do not correspond, but that they are actually repugnant. Yet his lordship speaks with full confidence of the conclusion derived from this reference: "Here," he says, "is a remarkable passage, well worthy of the attention of critics, who wish to *ascertain* the much disputed point, *the date* of the poem before us;" and he proceeds to point out the precise fact, to which the allusion here is made, "that of the *destroying angel* seen by David in the act of inflicting a plague upon Jerusalem, and commanded to stay his hand in consequence of the atonement which the *interceding angel* ordered King David, by the prophet Gad, to offer unto God;" and the correspondence, of course, is made to consist in there being an interceding and a destroying angel found both in the history and in the poem. Now, it unfortunately happens that it is not quite clear that there is an angel spoken of in the poem at all; but, admitting that there be, it appears that we have then in this place an interceding angel only, and no

It certainly seems strange, that an hypothesis, which reduces the date of this book to the times of the Babylonish captivity, and which ascribes the production of so sublime a poem to such a writer as Ezra, should, after having been so completely exploded, be at this day revived; revived, too, in the face of the triumphant arguments of Grey, Peters, Lowth, and Michaelis: and without any one reason advanced for its support, or any one argument against any of the numerous and powerful objections which those writers have brought against it. All the various ingenuity and erudition of a Warburton had been pressed into the service of this hypothesis; all had been employed to deck out a system for its support. A machinery was contrived; an allegory was dressed up; an assemblage of imposing circumstances imagined; an end devised; means suited to that end dexterously adapted; and the reader's curiosity was at least excited and amused, if his judgment was not convinced. But now, after all this machinery has been broken up; after this engaging allegory, with all its plausible accompaniments, has been proved to be but a splendid vision, a baseless fabric, the mere dream of a luxuriant and uncontrolled imagination,—one of those that issue from the ivory gate,—is it not too much to be called upon by a cold, dull, and cheerless *ipse dixit*, to replace the fragments of the shattered structure, to embrace the visionary theory as an established truth, and to surrender to the unsupported assertions of Bishop Stock, what had been refused to the learned and subtle argumentations of Bishop Warburton? When I speak of the mere assertion of his lordship, I desire that it may be remembered, that I allude exclusively to his reduction of the date of the poem to the time of Ezra. Some colour of argument I admit to have been held forth for his lowering it to the age of David; but none whatever has been offered for the transition from David to Ezra. This interval of above five hundred years, including the times of all the early prophets, the first of whom (Jonah) was near two hundred years later than the death of David, is flung away without ceremony; and the reader, who may have been sufficiently complaisant to travel with the bishop so far down as to the second of the Jewish kings, finds himself unexpectedly transported, at once and without notice, to a period nearly one hundred years later than the return from the captivity.

As a translator of the Book of Job, his lordship was more particularly called upon to discuss the probability of this last supposed era of its production than of any other, inasmuch as many arguments advanced particularly against this era are derived from the nature of the style and language of the poem; a subject on which it is remarkable that his lordship, whose immediate business was with the language of the book, has given no opinion whatever, unless what may be conceived to be implied in the supposition, that the period of the captivity was the era of the work, and Ezra its author. Perhaps Bishop Lowth was too severe upon his rival critic Warburton, when he pronounced, upon his advancing the same supposition, that the man who could seriously entertain it must not have "read either Job or Ezra in their original, and with a competent knowledge of the language," (*Letter to Warb.* p. 74.) This admirable critic proceeds, however, at length, (from p. 73 to p. 95,) to detail those distinctive characters of style, which (he thinks) establish the truth of his positions, touching the antiquity of the composition in question,—and which it might not be disadvantageous to some modern critics to peruse. He concludes his valuable remarks on this head with the following words:—"But what is the difference between these," (namely, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel,) "in comparison of the difference between the author of the Book of Job and Ezra? Let any one properly qualified to judge in this matter read the plain historical narrative in the two first chapters of Job; it is neat, concise, clear in its order and method, pure and elegant in its expression: let him then turn to Ezra, and find, if he can, a single Hebrew chapter, on which he can with a safe conscience bestow any part of this commendation. Let him, moreover, take into the account this last author's barbarous terms; and then let him tell me fairly, whether he does not find as much

---

destroying one; and that in the history we have a destroying angel, and no interceding one,—that is, the poem and the history are directly opposite in their characteristic features. There are other circumstances of obvious unsuitableness, on which it is unnecessary to enlarge. The answer of Peters, even to the application made to Hezekiah, supplies at once a refutation of this. To Schultens, Grey, Scott, and Dathe, in their annotations on the place, I refer the reader; also to Schnurrer's judicious view of it, *Dissert. Phil. Crit.* pp. 275—277.

difference between these two writers as between Sallust and William of Malmsbury. Let him next look into the poetical parts of Job, and let him compare them with any part of Ezra's undoubted writings, and I would then ask him, whether he would not as soon pitch upon Geoffrey of Monmouth for the author of the *Eneid*, if that were a doubtful point, as Ezra for the author of the poem of Job; and I should not much doubt of his answering in the affirmative," (*Letter to Warb.* pp. 96, 97.)

Bishop Lowth does not stand single in these opinions. For the evidence supplied to the antiquity of the Book of Job from the nature of its language, I refer the reader to pp. 154—156; and in the subjoined note,[36] the opinions of some of the most distinguished Hebrew critics will be found in a more detailed state to yield confirmation to the above positions. In speaking of Le Clerc, who has led the way to the reduction of the date of this poem to the age of Ezra, Schultens has made the following observations:—"Dolenda est conditio linguarum orientalium, prout eæ a multis tractantur. Unus, alter, tertius ad summum annus iis percipiendis datur. Analysis satis prompta. Explicatio ad receptam versionem non omnino impedita. Placent profectus; et jam metam se tenere credunt, qui carceribus vix egressi.—Quid causæ? Tum alia, de quibus alias, tum hoc vel maxime, quod qui in Græcis, Latinisve, non satis subactus, sibi aliquid arroget, mox in ordinem cogatur, atque ad subsellia relegetur: qui in Orientalibus, etiam in re pauperi ditissimus, non sibi tantum, sed et reliquis, videatur, si modo ope Lexici aliquid in medium proferre, mercesque suas venditare queat." Are our commentators of the present day more conversant in Hebrew literature, and more cautious in giving to the public their interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures, than Le Clerc?

We have now seen how indefensible, in the opinion of the most distinguished Hebrew critics, that hypothesis appears, which, reducing the Book of Job to the period of the captivity, ascribes its production to such an author as Ezra. In embracing this hypothesis, however, the Bishop of Killalla has but trodden in the steps of others. But what shall we say to that, which reduces Job himself to so late a date? This, I apprehend, is a discovery that has been entirely reserved for his lordship: at least I know of no commentator who is entitled to dispute with him the honour, whatever it may be, that belongs to the invention. It cannot, indeed, be affirmed, that he has laboured directly and specially to establish this point. But has he not so conducted his reasoning, as that it must follow by necessary implication? In the observations which have been offered at the outset of these remarks, pp. 159—161, we have seen that the time of Job, and the date of the book, are treated by him as in all respects the same.[37] If, therefore, his lordship has succeeded in bringing down the latter below the Babylonish captivity, he must be considered, on his own principles, as having done the same by the former.

---

[36] On the idea that Ezra could have written in that pure and poetic style, which is to be found in the Mosaic writings, the Psalms, and the Book of Job, Michaelis makes the following remarks:—"Nihil Ezrâ inornatius; ut mirer, quo erroris portento Mosaica illi scripta tribui potuerint: quanquam non est, quod mirer, cum facinus simillimum ausus sit Harduinus." (*Præf. in Not. et Epim.* p. ix.) Again, "Comparet cui lubet, quæ ante et post exilium Babylonis Hebraice scripta supersunt; nec minorem inveniet labem ac ruinam quam in linguâ Latinâ. Quapropter est mihi veri dissimillimum, grande ac poeticum spirantes psalmos post reditum ex Babylone scriptos fuisse—*Ezræ* certe, *cujus Hebraismo nihil est humilius et ingratius*, psalmos nobilissimos tribuere, peccato vicinum est Harduini, odas Horatianas infimæ linguæ Latinæ ætati tribuentis," (p. 196.) Again, speaking particularly of the Book of Job, he says, "Totius poematis ea est puritas, elegantia, sublimitas, quâ nihil majus perfectiusque in toto Hebraico codice superest.—Hocne poema, auream ubique linguæ Hebraicæ et Mosaicam ætatem spirans, ad ferrea illa tempora detrudamus, quæ extincto uno bono poetâ, Jeremia, nihil perfecti ac ne quidem mediocriter pulcri, fuderunt?" (pp. 187, 188.) Schultens is not less strong in his remarks upon the language and antiquity of Job:—"Nullus inter sacros codices tam genuinum remotissimæ antiquitatis præfert characterem. Multo facilius Ennianæ linguæ venerandum decus et pondus, expressisset scriptor aliquis ferreæ ætatis, quam Hebræus ab exilio Babylonico redux grandissimum illud, magnificum, intemeratum, ultimæ vetustatis notâ eminentissimâ impressum, quod è sublimi hacce, tam materiâ, quam stylo, compositione relucet. *Hoc qui discernere non valet, næ ille vel dissipate, vel imperite, judicare censendus.*" (Præf. * * * 3.) Warburton, who was not suspected of very deep knowledge of the Hebrew language, was little qualified to feel, and less disposed to admit, the force of such reasoning as the above. He therefore made no reply to the arguments so powerfully pressed upon him from these sources by Bishop Lowth in his Letter; although, as appears from a private communication to his friend Hurd, he found himself most sorely galled by his more critical adversary. See p. 369 of *Letters from a late eminent Prelate.*

Having adverted to these *Letters*, I cannot avoid transcribing an extraordinary passage relating to the Book of Job, as an instance of the whimsical originality, for which that extraordinary man conceived his superior talents to have afforded him a licence:—"Poor Job! It was his eternal fate to be persecuted by his friends. His three comforters passed sentence of condemnation upon him, and he has been executing *in effigie* ever since. He was first bound to the stake by a long catena of Greek Fathers; then tortured by Pineda; then strangled by Caryl; and afterwards cut up by Wesley, and anatomized by Garnet. Pray don't reckon me amongst his hangmen. I only acted the tender part of his wife, and was for making short work with him. But he was ordained, I think, by a fate like that of Prometheus, to lie still upon his dunghill, and have his brains sucked out by owls." Pp. 29, 30.

[37] It is possible that his lordship may, to the justness of the assertion which I have here repeated from the place referred to, object the following words, which will be found quoted from his preface in p. 158:—"But, if it were ever so difficult to ascertain the portion of time when the *patriarch lived*, it may not be impossible, from the internal marks in the poem itself, to conjecture with tolerable certainty the *era of its author.*" I do not deny, that the bishop has here spoken of the times of Job himself and of the author of the book as not necessarily connected; nor do I assert that he deliberately intended to consider them as the same; I only affirm, that in his reasoning (whether intentionally or not) they are completely confounded.

The last note of the translation explicitly affirms, that Job must have lived after the time of David. The entire scheme of the reasoning pronounces, that he must have lived in the time of Ezra.

On this result I think it not necessary to offer any comment.[38] And, indeed, it is not without some pain that I have been led to comment upon his lordship's work at all. There are many reasons why I could have wished to forbear; and among these is not the least forcible, the circumstance of its having issued from a member of that distinguished order in the Church, to which I feel at all times disposed, from inclination not less than duty, to pay the utmost deference and respect. This last consideration, however, upon reflection, seemed to render it the more necessary that I should undertake the unpleasing task, in which I have been engaged throughout the latter part of this Number. I had already given to the public, in a former edition of this work, those remarks on the history and Book of Job which are contained in the former part of the Number. I had, upon grounds which appeared to me satisfactory, maintained the antiquity both of the book and of its subject; and from this had derived an argument in favour of the antiquity and wide extent of the sacrificial rite. I had also, proceeding in a way directly opposite to that which the bishop has, in his preface, described himself to have pursued, spared neither pains nor time to acquire the best information, and from the best interpreters, before I presumed to offer my ideas to the public. Soon after I had done so, the bishop's work appeared, carrying with it the authority of his station, and, by a single dictum, levelling the whole of my laborious structure in the dust. That my observations were not thought worthy of notice by his lordship, could not cause, even to the feelings of an author, much uneasiness, as the works of the most learned and celebrated commentators on Job were left not only unnoticed, but confessedly unperused. What remained, under these circumstances, to be done? Silence might be construed into an admission, that what I had before advanced had been unadvisedly offered, and could not be maintained; and, on the other hand, in treating of the bishop's performance, justice required that I should speak of it in terms remote from those of commendation. Executed with a haste that nothing can excuse; abounding with errors both of reasoning and interpretation; presuming, upon slight and fancied theories, to new-mould the original text;[39] and withal setting the seal of Episcopal authority to the entire congeries of precipitancies, mistakes, and mutilations—a due regard to my own

---

[38] If any were requisite on a point so perfectly untenable, the observations in the first part of this Number would abundantly supply it.

[39] Bishop Stock prides himself on a list of conjectural alterations of the Hebrew text, contained in an Appendix to his translation,—by which it appears, as he pronounces, that there are more than sixty places in Job, in which the text has been corrupted. By much the greater number of these alterations is proposed upon the reading of a single MS., or of a couple at the most; and what deserves yet more to be remarked is, that, for not fewer than twenty-three, no authority of any MS. or version whatever is pretended, but the name of Stock alone is annexed, as a sufficient justification! To this, it must be remembered, that we are to add, the rejection of the two last verses of the book upon the same unsupported dictum. These, one would think, are tolerable exercises of the conjectural faculty; and yet, strange to say, they are far exceeded by one which yet remains to be noticed; and which will be found contained in the notes on chap. xli. 11, 12.

"I am strongly of opinion, that, in the original of this fine poem, the speech attributed to God ended here," (viz. end of verse 12:) "not only because it forms a fuller and more dignified conclusion than that which now closes the chapter; but because it assigns a satisfactory answer to the question, With what view was this laboured description introduced, of the two formidable works of the Creator, the river horse and the crocodile? Answer that question yourselves, saith the Almighty: if ye shrink with terror before my works, how will ye dare to set yourselves in array against their Maker? But to whom then shall we ascribe the Appendix contained in the last two-and-twenty verses of the forty-first chapter? Either to the author himself of the poem, who, in his second but not better thoughts, conceived he might add something valuable to his picture of the crocodile; or, which is more likely, to some succeeding genius, impatient to lengthen out by his inventive powers what had justly obtained possession of the public esteem. After enclosing therefore in brackets a superfetation that might well have been spared, we will go on, however, to give light to it.—Observe how the Appendix is ushered in: [12. 'I will not be silent,' &c.] Is this language for the Omnipotent? Is it at all suitable to the grandeur of conception manifested in the rest of the poem? the thread is too visible, by which the purple patch, of more show than utility, is fastened on."

Here, indeed, is critical amputation with a vengeance. And here we have a large portion of the original at one stroke scored off, and rejected as a *superfetation*, (so his Lordship is pleased to call it,) exactly in the same manner as we find the history of the birth of Christ, in the beginning of Matthew and Luke, scored off, as a *superfetation*, by the Editors of the *Unitarian New Testament*. Heath had, indeed, transposed the first fourteen verses of the fortieth chapter, and inserted them between the sixth and seventh verses of the forty-second. For this, too, he had assigned a reason not deficient in plausibility. But to reject altogether an entire portion of the book, and this upon the merely fanciful and figurative ground of a "thread too visible" and a "purple patch," has been reserved for a bishop of the Established Church.

Having adverted to the subject of conjectural emendation of the Sacred Text, I cannot but enter my protest most decidedly against the spirit, which has, of late years, so mischievously infected the translators of the books of Scripture in that particular respect. The Bishop of Killalla, unfortunately, has had no small degree of countenance in such practices. By others, and those, too, critics of no small repute, this spirit has been too much indulged. The late Bishop of St Asaph has well observed, that considering the matter only as a problem in the doctrine of chances, the odds are always infinitely against conjecture. (Horsley's *Hosea*, pref. p. xxxiv.)—The consequences growing out of the habit of altering the original Hebrew according to conjecture, must be, that we shall cease altogether to possess a standard text, and that for the word of God, we shall ultimately have only the word of man. Bishop Pocock justly observes upon this practice, that, "every one, for introducing any where such a meaning as pleased him best, might alter the words as he pleased, of which there would be no end; and it would be a matter of very ill consequence indeed. We must," he adds, "fit our meaning to the words, and not the words to our meaning." (Pocock's *Works*, vol. ii. p. 493.)—That the MSS. and ancient versions are not to be called in, to assist credit, but, infinitely more, a due regard to the cause of truth, demanded that such a work should not be allowed to pass upon the world as a faithful exposition of a part of sacred writ. In my observations upon the individual defects of this work, I have not thought it necessary to travel beyond the course which the bishop's remarks upon the date of Job unavoidably prescribed. But I cannot dismiss the subject finally without saying, that, in my opinion, the necessity for a new English version of the Book of Job (if any be supposed previously to have existed) has in no particular been diminished by that which has been given to the world by the Bishop of Killalla.[40]

As a matter of curiosity, and as supplying some relief from the *tædium controversiæ*, I annex a short account of the history of Job, as it has been handed down amongst the Arabians.

Job, or Aiub, (as he is called in Arabic, agreeably to the Hebrew name איוב,) is reported by some of their historians to have been descended from Ishmael; it being held, that from Isaac, through Jacob, all the prophets had sprung, excepting three, Job, Jethro, (the father-in-law of Moses, called by the Arabians Schoaib,) and Mahomet; which three had come of the line of Ishmael, and were Arabians. By others, his descent is traced from Isaac, through Esau, from whom he was the third, or at most the fourth, in succession. And in the history given by Khendemir, who distinguishes him by the title of *the Patient*, it is stated that by his mother's side he was descended from Lot: that he had been commissioned by God to preach the faith to a people of Syria: that, although no more than three had been converted by his preaching, he was, notwithstanding, rewarded for his zeal by immense possessions: that his wealth and prosperity excited the envy of the devil, who, presenting himself before God, charged Job with motives of self-interest in his religious obedience, and asserted, that if the Almighty would deprive him of his substance, his boasted allegiance would not hold out for a single day: that the devil obtained permission to strip him of his wealth, but that Job's fidelity remained unshaken: that having received still farther permission to afflict him in his person, the devil infused by a pestilential breath such infection as to render Job's entire body one putrid ulcer, and of a nature so offensive, as to repel from him every attendant, and to force the inhabitants to drive him out of the city into a remote and solitary place, whither his wife carried every day what was necessary for his subsistence: that the devil constantly stole from her whatever she had provided for this purpose; and having reduced her to such a condition, that she had nothing remaining for her husband's relief, he appeared to her in the form of a bald old woman, and offered, upon condition of her giving two tresses of hair that hung upon her neck, to furnish her every day with what she might require for her husband's subsistence: that Job's wife having agreed to the proposal, and parted with the tresses, the devil produced the hair to Job, affirming that it had been cut from his wife's head when caught in the act of matrimonial unfaithfulness: that Job, enraged against his wife, was led to swear, that if he recovered his health he would most severely punish her for her offence: that the devil, having thus got the better of Job's patience, transformed himself to an angel of light, and published to the people of the surrounding country that Job had forfeited the favour of God, and that they should no longer permit him to abide among them: that Job, being informed of what had passed, had recourse to God by prayer, who in a moment put an end to all his sufferings; for that the angel Gabriel descended to the place where he was, and, striking the earth with his foot, caused a fountain of the purest water to spring up, wherein Job having washed his body and drank of it, was suddenly and perfectly restored to health: and that, after this, God multiplied his riches in such a manner, that, to express the abundance of it, the Arabian authors say that a shower of gold fell upon him. See D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* tom. i. pp. 75, 76, 432, 458; also Sale's *Koran*, vol. ii. p. 162, in which latter place the story is given with some minute variations.

The reader will of course consider these fables as introduced here principally for his amusement. One fact, however, they unequivocally speak—the belief of the Arabians that there was in reality such a person as Job, who lived in the patriarchal age, and was distinguished above all men by his sufferings and his patience. The reverence for the name of Job has been in truth from the earliest times, and to this day continues to be, through all Arabia, extremely great; so that many of the noblest families among the Arabians have gloried in being descended from that patriarch. The famous dynasty of the great Saladin have been known by the name of Aioubites, or Jobites, their illustrious founder being called by the name of Job. (D'Herb. *Bib. Orient.* tom. i. p. 76.) The reverence for this name

---

in rectifying the Hebrew text, where confusion has manifestly arisen, I am very far indeed from contending: but that what is properly called conjecture should be permitted to interfere, and now especially, after the immense labours of Kennicott and De Rossi in their collation of the various copies of the Hebrew, is, I think, wholly inadmissible. This is not the place to enlarge upon such a subject. I would strongly recommend to the perusal of the reader the judicious observations of Bishop Horsley, in his preface, as before referred to, and at p. xxxix. See also *Dathii Opuscula*, p. 135—137.

[40] His lordship has, since the publication of the second edition of this work, been advanced to the See of Waterford. To avoid confusion, however, I have continued to designate him by the title under which he is known to the public as the translator of Job.

has, I am sorry to say, been carried still farther amongst Christians: the worship of Job being (as Broughton tells us) of great antiquity, both amongst the Greek and Latin churches; the Greeks having chosen the 6th of May for celebrating the festival of Saint Job, and the Latins keeping it on the 10th. *Diction. of all Relig.* vol. i. p. 538.

No. LX. — Page 19. Col. 1.

ON GROTIUS'S STRANGE MISCONCEPTION OF THE NATURE OF ABEL'S SACRIFICE.

Grotius, followed by Le Clerc, interprets the words in Gen. iv. 4, which we translate *the firstlings*, as signifying the *best* and *finest;* and will have this to relate. only to the *wool*, which is known to have been offered to the gods in later times. That also which we render *the fat thereof*, he considers to mean no more than the *milk*, and appeals to the Seventy, who in numerous instances have certainly translated the word חלב, here used, by γάλα.

But first, as to בכורים, it cannot be denied, that, in relation to man or beast, it is never found in any part of the Bible in any other sense than that of *first-born.* So appropriate is this meaning, that בכור is used absolutely, to express primogeniture, and the right resulting from it, as in Gen. xxv. 31 — 34, and xliii. 33. It is, indeed, applied to *first fruits*, or fruits *first ripe;* but this evidently refers to its radical signification of *first-born;* nor can any instance be adduced of the application of the term in the figurative sense of *finest* and *best*, contended for by Grotius, unless such a signification be tacitly supposed to attach in all cases to the idea of the *first*, or *earliest*, in its kind. He has, indeed, referred us to the expression בכור מות in Job, xviii. 13; to the use of the word בכורים, applied to the fruit of the fig-tree; and to the force of the term בכור, employed to denominate the species of camel distinguished for its swiftness. But none of these instances can bear him out.

The first, which he would arbitrarily render " morbus maxime lethalis," is no more than " the *first-born* of death," a strong poetical expression; for the more particular meaning of which see Parkhurst on the word, and Chappelow on Job, xviii. 13. The second, which he says implies " ficus maxime fructiferæ," is an expression peculiarly unfortunate, as the word in this application is used to denote that species of fig which is *early ripe;* insomuch that at this day the word[1] *boccôre* (בכור) signifies, in the Levant, the *early fig*, as Shaw states in his *Travels*, p. 370, fol. As to the third instance, the reason of applying this term to the fleetest species of camel, is not the general idea of distinction and superiority, but the peculiar quality of swiftness; the idea of celerity and prevention being most appositely conveyed by a term, whose radical signification implied the *first*, or *earliest.* In this sense the word is explained in the kindred dialects of the Syriac and (particularly) the Arabic; for which see Schindler and Castell. Indeed, no lexicon whatever, so far as I can discover, supports Grotius in the general signification which he attributes to the word. But all concur in giving to it the meaning of the *earliest* or *first produced*, or some other flowing from and connected with these.

Again, with respect to the word חלב, although it is undoubtedly used in several places to signify *milk*, as well as *fat*, yet, as Heidegger remarks, (*Hist. Patr. Exercit.* v. § 20, tom. i.) there is not a single passage in Scripture, in which it is applied in that sense, when sacrifice is spoken of, and the offering is said to be מחלב.

But, moreover, as to Grotius's notion, that the wool and milk were the parts of the animal which alone were offered by Abel on this occasion, it is notorious that neither one nor the other is ever mentioned in Scripture as an offering to the Deity, unless this single passage be supposed to supply an instance. Kennicott also contends, in opposition to Grotius, that the strict analogy of translation will not admit the possibility of his construction of this passage of Genesis. " For if," says he, " it be allowed by all, that ' Cain's bringing *of the* fruit of the ground,' means his bringing ' *the* fruit of the ground,' then Abel's ' bringing *of the* firstlings of his flock,' must likewise mean his bringing ' *the* firstlings of his flock,' " the exact sameness in the original phrase requiring an exact similarity in the translation. (*Two Dissert.* pp. 192, 193.) The passage, indeed, needs but to be read to prove the whimsical conceit of this comment of Grotius. Not one word is said of wool, or that can lead the mind to it by any conceivable reference; but yet, because he is determined not to allow the sacrifice of Abel to have been an oblation of the animal itself, and there being no part of it that could be offered, without slaying the animal, except the wool and the milk, he is therefore led to pronounce that in the offering of these the sacrifice consisted.

Nothing, in truth, can be more strangely chimerical than the whole of Grotius's observations on this part of Scripture. His criticisms on the words מפרי האדמה, furnishes another extraordinary specimen. " By these words," he says, " nothing more is meant than what the heathens in later times understood by their *Săgmen*, which was a sort of turf, cut out of sacred ground, and carried sometimes in the hand of a Roman ambassador." On this Heidegger is compelled to exclaim, " Sæpe vir, cætera magnus, ex paganis ritibus talia, obtorto collo, ad explicationem rerum sacrarum rapit ; quæ, si propius intueare, nec cœlum nec terram attingunt." (*Exercit.* v. § 19.) But to return.

---

[1] See Lowth's Isai. xxviii. 4; Blayney's Jer. xxiv. 2; and Newcome's Hos. ix. 10.

With respect to the word חלבהן, it may be right to remark, that, instead of "the fat *thereof*," (which is ambiguous,) it may with more propriety be rendered, "the fat *of them*," meaning thereby, the fattest or best among the firstlings. It is well known that the word חלב is often used for the *best of its kind.* Thus חלב חטה, is the *finest* of the wheat, (Ps. lxxxi. 16 ; cxlvii. 14.) And the *fat* of the oil, the *fat* of the wine, stand for the *best* of the oil and wine, and have been so translated,[2] (Numb. xviii. 12.) It is the more necessary to make this distinction, lest the particular mention of the fat might lead to the supposition that the sacrifice was a peace-offering, the fat of which was consumed upon the altar, and the flesh eaten by the priests and the person at whose charge the offering was made. This was clearly an offering of a later date. The use of animal food was not as yet permitted. And the sacrifice seems to have been a holocaust, the whole of which was consumed upon the altar. That the sacrifice was of this kind many arguments concur to render probable. (See p. 131 ; also Shuck. *Connect.* vol. i. p. 81.) But it is placed beyond the possibility of doubt, if it be admitted, with the authorities and reasons adduced in pp. 147, 148, that the sign of the Divine acceptance of Abel's sacrifice was the consumption of it by fire from heaven. Porphyry, in his second book, *De Abstin. Anim.* considers this a sufficient reason to pronounce the offering of Abel to have been a holocaust, and compares it with that of Solomon, described in 2 Chr. vii. 1, where it is said, that "when Solomon had made an end of praying, the fire came down from heaven, and consumed the burnt-offering (or holocaust) and the sacrifices."

No. LXI. — Page 19. Col. 1.

ON THE DIFFERENCE IN THE DIVINE RECEPTION OF THE SACRIFICES OF CAIN AND ABEL.

To those who reject the divine institution of sacrifice, this has always proved a stumbling-block ; and to remove the difficulty, various solutions have been elaborately, but unsuccessfully, devised. The difference in the treatment of the two brothers had been accounted for by ancient commentators, from the different mode of division of their several oblations, as if Cain's fault had consisted in not giving to God the best parts, or the proper parts of the sacrifice. This unintelligible notion, which an early enemy of revelation, Julian, failed not to urge against Christians, took its rise from the Septuagint translation of Gen. iv. 7. *Οὐκ, ἐὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκης, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλης, ἥμαρτες,* — "If you should rightly offer, but yet not rightly divide, would you not sin ?"

Others have held, that the difference arose from this, that, whilst Abel brought of the *firstlings* of his flock, Cain did not, in like manner, bring of the *first* or *best* of his fruits. This idea, for which there appears no farther foundation in the original, than that it is simply stated that Cain brought *of the fruits,* originated with Philo, (as may be seen in p. 77 of this work,) and has had the support of several Christian commentators. See Cyril. *cont. Julian,* lib. x. p. 349, ed. Spanh. Lips. and Pol. *Synop.* in Gen. iv. 3. Hallet also, in his note (*s*) on Heb. xi. 4, concurs in this idea, and at the same time adds, that Abel's faith caused him to select the choicest for sacrifice. Primate Newcome, in his new version, seems to adopt the same notion, explaining the "more excellent sacrifice" in Heb. xi. 4, as "consisting of more choice and valuable offerings."

Again, the reason of the difference assigned by Josephus, (*Antiq. Jud.* lib. i. c. 3,) is, that "God was more pleased with the spontaneous productions of nature, than with an offering extorted from the earth by the ingenuity and force of man." This strange conceit has been confined to Josephus, and the Rabbins, from whom Havercamp affirms, and Cunæus and Heidegger fully prove, it was derived by this author.—See Krebs. *Observ. in Nov. Test.* p. 383.

Another reason assigned is the difference of moral character. But the history clearly connects the fact of the acceptance of the one and the rejection of the other, with the nature and circumstances of the respective oblations.

Again, it is said that Cain's entertaining a design against his brother's life laid the foundation for the difference of treatment. But this intention against his brother's life is expressly affirmed to have been the consequence of the preference given to his brother's offering.

Dr Priestley has observed[1] (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 195,) that "the actions of both the brothers" (in the offerings made by them of

---

[2] See Chrysost. Jun. Vatab. ; also Jen. *Jew. Antiq.* vol. i. p. 149 ; and Kenn *Two Diss.* pp. 193, 194.

[1] This essay of Dr Priestley, in which (as has been stated in p. 130 of this work) he has laboured to disprove the divine institution of sacrifices, and to establish their mere human invention as springing from anthropomorphitical notions of the Deity, it may be curious to compare with his latest observations on this subject in his *Notes*, &c. on Gen. iv. 3. There, in treating of the offerings of Cain and Abel, he expressly asserts his belief in the divine origin of sacrifices. "On the whole," he says, "it seems most probable, that men were instructed by the Divine Being himself in this mode of worship," (sacrifice,) "as well as taught many other things that were necessary to their subsistence and comfort."

This observation, together with those which have been already referred to, (pp. 129, 130,) cannot be read without wonder, when it is considered, that the author of them had spent a life in the continued endeavour to refute the assertions which they contain. This, however, after all, but shews the vast difference there is the flock and of the fruits) "seem to have been of the same nature, and to have had exactly the same meaning." In this I entirely agree with him. Viewed in the light of reason merely, the distinction made between them by the Deity is utterly unaccountable. Sacrifices being considered as gifts, or as federal rites, or as symbolical actions, expressing the dispositions and sentiments of the offerer, or in any way that human invention can be conceived to have devised them; the actions of the two brothers appear to stand precisely on the same ground, each bringing an offering of that which he respectively possessed, and each thus manifesting his acknowledgment and worship of the great Author of his possessions.

But what do I infer from this? That reason cannot untie the knot; and that to revelation consequently we must look for the solution. Here the difficulty vanishes, and all appears connected and satisfactory, as I trust is shewn in the account given of this matter in the second of these Discourses.—See pp. 19, 20.

The words of Cloppenburg on this subject deserve to be noticed:—"Etsi diversæ oblationi videatur occasionem præbuisse diversum vitæ institutum, ipsi tamen diversitati oblationis hoc videtur subesse, quod Abel pecudum oblatione cruentâ ante omnia curavit, *τὸ ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αἵματι, propitiationem per fidem in sanguine*, quo necessario purificanda erant dona Deo oblata, Heb. ix. 22, 23.—Cainus autem, oblatione solâ Eucharisticâ de fructu terræ defungens, supinè neglexerit sacrificium *ἱλαστικὸν*, ut eo nomine Deo displicuerit, neque potuerit obtinere *Justitiæ Dei, quæ ex fide est, testimonium*, quod non perhibebat Deus, neglecto istoc externo symbolo supplicationis ex fide pro remissione peccatorum obtinendâ. Quemadmodum ergo, in cultu spirituali, publicanus supplicans cum peccatorum *ἐξομολογήσει* descendit in domum suam justificatus præ pharisæo, cum gratiarum actione, Deo vovente decimas omnium quæ possidebat, Luc. xviii. 12,—sic censemus hâc parte potiorem fuisse Abelis oblationem præ oblatione Caini, quod ipse supplicationem suam pro impetrandâ peccatorum remissione testatus sit per sacrificii propitiatorii cruentam oblationem, cum alter dona sua eucharistico ritu offerret, *χωρὶς αἱματοχυσίας*." *Sacrif. Patriarch. Schola.* p. 15. On the subject of this Number see Kennic. *Two. Dissert.* p. 225—238, and Barrington's *Misc. Sacr.* p. 69—71.

No. LXII.—Page 19. Col. 1.

ON THE TRUE MEANING OF THE PHRASE, ΠΛΕΙΟΝΑ ΘΥΣΙΑΝ, ATTRIBUTED TO THE SACRIFICE OF ABEL.

Dr Kennicott's criticism on this passage, combined with Gen. iv. 4, is too remarkable to be passed over in silence. The words, *πλείονα θυσίαν*, he contends, should be rendered a sacrifice *greater*, or *more*, in reference to *number*, rather than to *value;* for that, although *πολὺς* in the positive sense does sometimes signify *excellens, præstans*, yet in the other degrees of comparison it is never so used; but that *πλείων* has constantly the signification of *plus, amplior, copiosior*, or *numerosior;* and for this he refers to the several lexicons of Budæus, Constantine, Gesner, Hederic, Leigh, Scapula, and Stephens: and from Stephens's *Concordance* he says it appears, that *πλείων* has not the sense of *præstantior*, through the whole of the New Testament. The idea of number, he says, necessarily strikes us; and therefore Wickliffe's, which reads a *much more sacrifice*, he affirms to be a just translation; and that Queen Elizabeth's version was right, in preserving the force of this, by rendering the words, *a greater sacrifice.*

In conformity with these observations he suggests an interpretation of Gen. iv. 4, which, I apprehend, is peculiar to himself; namely, that Cain brought a single offering, of the fruits of the ground; and Abel a double oblation, consisting likewise of the fruits, and of an animal sacrifice besides. His principal argument in support of this novel idea is derived from the use of the word *Mincha* in this place; the meaning of which, he says, is fixed precisely in Levit. ii. 1, and confined to an unbloody oblation, viz. a *meat-offering;* or, as we generally appropriate the word meat to flesh, more properly a *bread-offering.* This term, he argues, being here applied to Abel's oblation, and being totally inapplicable to the animal sacrifice which he is expressly said to have offered, it follows, that he must likewise have made an offering of the fruit of the ground such as Cain had brought. And this, he contends, the very turn of expression in the original strongly indicates; for that, in strictness, the passage should be rendered, "Cain brought of the fruit of the ground, a *Mincha* to Jehovah—and Abel brought (the same,) he *also* (brought) of the firstlings," &c.; for that in the words, והבל הביא גם חוא, the particle גם cannot be joined to the verb immediately preceding, from the nature of the position, and its connection with a second nominative case—and that, agreeably to this, the Seventy have rendered the clause, Καὶ *Ἄβελ ἤνεγκε καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῶν πρωτοτόκων.*

---

between the disputant and the inquirer. The wonder is easily removed by the view already taken of this matter in p. 130. And, upon the whole, there seems good reason to think, that, had Dr Priestley been permitted, for a longer period, to enjoy that freedom from angry polemics, which was indulged to the few concluding years of his life, he would have grown into a juster acquaintance with many of the vital truths of Scripture, and would have retracted many of those noxious opinions which he had so long and so assiduously toiled to disseminate.

This criticism of Dr Kennicott seems, however, unworthy of so great a name; for even admitting, that the particle גם is to be connected, not with the preceding verb, but with the second nominative case, the inference drawn by Dr Kennicott will by no means follow; there being no form of expression more familiar to the Hebrew, than the emphatic repetition of the persons spoken of, with this particle גם adjoined. To adduce instances of this were idle, as it is one of the most common idioms of the language. Whoever wishes for examples, however, may find them in sufficient plenty, in *Nold. Concord. Partic. Ebr.* pp. 201, 202. Now, in this application of the particle, it is manifest, that the whole of Dr Kennicott's construction falls to the ground. Again, admitting the particle to be used in the additive sense, *also*, as Dr Kennicott's view of the passage requires, yet will not this justify his translation; since, being necessarily connected with the second nominative case by this writer's own admission, it can only mean, that Abel *also*, as well as Cain, brought an offering; whereas, according to Dr Kennicott, it must signify, that he brought *also* of the firstlings, &c. that is, he brought not only what Cain had brought, but *besides*, or *in addition to that*, of the firstlings of his flock; to make out which translation, the word *also* must be connected, not with the second nominative case הוא, or *αὐτός*, but with the following words, מבכרים, or *ἀπὸ τῶν ϖρωτοτόκων*, from which it is entirely disjoined by the intervening pronoun. Thus Dr Kennicott becomes inconsistent with himself, having first contended for the immediate conjunction of the particle with the second nominative case, and having then applied it in such a sense as to require its conjunction, not with this nominative case, but with another part of the sentence.

But he relies on the force of the word *Mincha*, which is applied only to Abel's offering: the Lord being said to have had "respect to Abel and to his *Mincha*." It is, then, of importance, to ascertain the true meaning of this word; and the more so because if this writer's sense of the term be admitted, and at the same time his theory of the double oblation be rejected, the necessary inference is, that no animal was slain by Abel, but that the offering must have been of the unbloody kind, and consequently that it was, as Grotius has contended, merely an offering of the milk and wool of his flock.

Now, it is in the first place to be remarked, that he explains the word *Mincha*, as applied to the offerings of Cain and Abel, by the exact definition of it, as we find it specifically used under the law, where it appears to be confined to offerings of the unbloody kind, (See *Two Dissert.* p. 188—192.) But if Dr Kennicott be right in explaining the *Mincha* in all cases by the strictness of the Levitical definition, then it necessarily follows, that Cain did not merely bring an offering of the fruits of the ground, but that he brought the very kind of meat-offering, or *Mincha*, appointed in the second chapter of Leviticus, where, as Kennicott emphatically observes, the description of the meat-offering concludes with these words, מנחה הוא, "this is a *Mincha*." Cain's offering, then, must have consisted of "fine flour with oil poured upon it, and frankincense placed thereon." The exact quantities also of the flour and oil, as prescribed in the law, must have been employed. This the force of Kennicott's argument indispensably requires. For he contends, that the very definition of the *Mincha*, as given in Leviticus, "determines the sense of the word absolutely in the five books of Moses; for that wherever the inspired author mentions the word *Mincha*, as a sacrificial term, he must certainly use it in the same sense; the same which had been settled upon it by God himself, before Genesis was composed."

Now, it is certain, that wherever the *Mincha*, properly so called, is spoken of under the law, it must be understood in the sense expressly given to it by the law: and in this reference it is, that Buxtorf, Reland, Outram, and Jos. Mede, (whom Kennicott quotes in justification of his opinion,) seem to have spoken of the *Mincha*. But, surely, when applied to oblations antecedent to the law, the term is not necessarily to be taken in that restrained sense, to which its general signification was limited, in later times, by those appropriate circumstances attached to it by the legal institution. It is undoubtedly true, as Gussetius, who is referred to by Kennicott, remarks, that a *Mincha* presented to God signifies an unbloody oblation. But when he says, that it always does so, and that "there is not one instance of its being used for an animal oblation throughout the Bible;" (*Comment. Ling. Ebr.* p. 473,) he, in the first place, begs the question respecting the sacrifice of Abel, which is expressly called a *Mincha*: secondly, he forgets, that every other instance of its sacrificial application is an instance of the use of the term under the law, by which its original meaning had been narrowed: and, lastly, both he and Kennicott materially err in point of fact; the word *Mincha* being frequently employed even under the law, to denote animal sacrifices, as well as the bread or flour-offerings. Thus in 1 Kings, xviii. 29, 36; 2 Kings, iii. 20; and Ezra, ix. 4, 5, we find the morning and evening sacrifices, which, beside a bread-offering and drink-offering, included also the offering of a lamb, described by the general appellation of *Mincha*. In Judges, vi. 18, the same term is applied to the offering of a kid with unleavened cakes. And in 1 Sam. ii. 17, and Mal. i. 13, 14, it is used in relation to animal sacrifice, in a manner the most explicit and unqualified. So that, although, as Rosenmüller on Levit. ii. 1, affirms, this word be applied *per eminentiam* to the oblation of corn, yet even under the law we find its more general signification force its way.

This proves decisively the weakness of Dr Kennicott's argument derived from the supposition that the words מנחה הוא, (Lev. ii. 6,) are to be understood in the sense, *This is a Mincha*, that is, as marking the precise meaning of the term, wherever it occurred in a sacrificial relation. Indeed, the circumstances of the various kinds of bread-offerings, comprehended under the term *Mincha*, which Kennicott himself admits to have existed, (pp. 190—192,) and of which there were not fewer than five, prove that this passage could not have been intended here as confining the term to the specific oblation to which it refers: and that it could only mean, that this oblation was one of those which might be included under the term *Mincha*. Vatablus renders the words, "*Munus est: i. e.* tale est munus quod offerri debet Deo." See also Fagius, Vatablus, Castalio, on Exod. xxx. 9.

It is certain that the true and original signification of the word, is that of an offering presented to a superior. Thus we find it in Gen. xxxii. 20, and xliii. 11, 15, in which places it is used for the purpose of appeasing; again, in 2 Chr. xxxii. 23, and Ps. lxxii. 10, where it is applied to offerings brought by strangers to the temple at Jerusalem; and also in 1 Kings, x. 25; 2 Chr. ix. 24; 2 Kings, viii. 8, 9, where it is used to denote the gifts sent to earthly princes. The word appears to be derived from an Arabic verb, signifying *donavit;* see Rosenm. and Le Clerc on Lev. ii. 1, and Schindl. *Lexic. Pentag.* Parkhurst derives it from the Hebrew verb נח, *quievit, posuit;* and Calasio from נחה, *duxit*, without, however, making any change in the signification. From this it follows, that all sacrificial offerings, whether bloody or unbloody, must fall under the general denomination, *Mincha*. That it is taken in this large sense by all lexicographers, Le Clerc (on Lev. ii. 1,) positively asserts. See also Castell, and especially Parkhurst, on the word.

Drusius (on Heb. xi. 4.) affirms, that it is of greater extent than is commonly admitted. Ainsworth observes, (on Lev. ii. 1,) that it "was generally any solemn gift, or present, to God, or man: in special, a present or sacrifice unto God: more specially, an offering of the fruits of the earth." Sykes also (*Essay*, &c. p. 17,) uses the word in the same general sense, whilst he admits, that "later use has pretty much confined it to oblations of flour or meal."

How little reason, then, Dr Kennicott had for introducing so novel and dangerous a criticism, is, I trust, upon the whole sufficiently evident. How inconsistent also it is with the ideas of sacrifice, which he holds in common with the doctrine maintained in these discourses, will appear, when it is considered, that if, in the case of Abel's oblation, the word *Mincha* be supposed to relate, not to the sacrifice of the animal, but solely to an offering of the fruits with which it was accompanied, it must follow, since God is said to have had respect to his *Mincha*, that it was not the animal sacrifice, but the offering of the fruits, which conciliated the divine regard. And thus the theory which pronounces the animal sacrifice to have been originally enjoined as a type of the great sacrifice of Christ, and which ascribes to this, as the instituted expression of the true faith, the superiority of Abel's offering over that of Cain, is at once overturned. And yet to this very theory it is, that Dr Kennicott, in his *Dissertation on the oblations of Cain and Abel*, has given his warmest support.

Perhaps it may not be amiss here, to endeavour to fix the true meaning and value of the sacrificial terms קרבן, מנחה, and זבח, *Corban*, *Mincha*, and *Zebach:* and the more particularly, as their relative force seems not to have been stated with exactness by any late writer. The first of these terms, being derived from קרב, signifies whatever was brought to God before the altar; whether dismissed, as the scape-goat; dedicated to the service of the sanctuary, as the sacred vessels, and the conductors of the sacred rites, the Levites; or offered up, as the sacrifices properly so called, which were consumed at the altar. Again, the *Mincha* was an oblation, which was of the nature of a sacrifice, being consumed at the altar, whether it consisted of things animate or inanimate, although, as we have seen, the Mosaic institution in a good degree narrowed its application; confining it, for the most part, to what is called the meat-offering, or, as it should in strictness be denominated, the bread or flour-offering. And lastly, the *Zebach* was the oblation of an animal slain in sacrifice. Thus, *Corban* is the most general term, including all sorts of offerings, or dedications, to God in his temple; *Mincha* is the next in order, applying to those offerings which were consumed at the altar; and *Zebach* is the *species infima* in the scale, relating only to the animal sacrifice.

But to return to Dr Kennicott, and the immediate subject of this note. His remark on the word *πλείων*, that it necessarily involves the idea of number, becomes now totally inapplicable. The idea of a double oblation in the case of Abel, which it was intended to support, has been shewn to be entirely groundless: and, indeed, his observations on the force of the word *πλείων* itself seem not less so. That "the notion of number is included in every application of the word throughout the New Testament," is so far from being true, that numerous passages may be cited, in which no such idea can possibly attach to the word. Thus, in Matt. vi. 25, "Is not the soul more (πλείων) than meat?"—and again, xii. 41. "Behold, a greater (πλείων) than Jonas is here." Many other such instances may be seen in Stephanus's *Greek Concordance*, to which Dr Kennicott has referred in support of his opinion. But the true force of the word, both in the positive and the comparative, may be best seen in Schleusner's *Lexicon*. It will thence appear, that the just value of the expression in the passage in Hebrews, has been given in the text: a more ample, or fuller sacrifice, expressing in emphatical terms, that which partook more largely and essentially of the true nature and virtue of sacrifice. Vatablus renders the word *uberiorem*.

No. LXIII. — Page 19. Col. 1.

ON THE NATURE AND GROUNDS OF THE FAITH EVIDENCED BY THE SACRIFICE OF ABEL.

"Faith," we are informed by the apostle, Rom. x. 17, "cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." This account of faith, combined with the numerous examples exhibited in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, in illustration of its nature, can leave us at no loss to pronounce, that Abel's offering was in obedience to a divine revelation. For it must be remarked, that in the several instances, adduced in this chapter, of persons actuated by this exalted principle, the belief of something declared, and a mode of action conformable to that belief, are uniformly exhibited. In like manner, then, as Noah, Abraham, and the rest, are represented as acting in consequence of a divine command, placing an entire reliance in the promise of him who commanded; so Abel, in the sacrifice which he offered, must be supposed to have acted under the same impression, — believing what God had promised, and therefore sacrificing as God had ordered. Indeed, as Heidegger remarks, the divine revelation was in his case even more necessary, than in any other of those mentioned.

The sacred writer again informs us, at the 13th verse of the same chapter, that Abel and all the others whom he had named, "died in faith" (*i. e.* as Hallet paraphrases it, "retained their faith, until their death, or the time of their leaving the world,") "not having received the promises," (not having received the completion of them; that being reserved for later times, as is intimated in the concluding part of the chapter, and is clearly expressed in Acts, xiii. 32, 33, "We declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children") — "but having seen them afar off; and were persuaded of them, and embraced them."

Now, that these promises included the promise of the Messiah, Kennicott says, is plain: "first, because this is the promise, peculiarly and emphatically so called throughout Scripture: and secondly, because that the temporal promises, respecting the land of Canaan, cannot alone, if at all, be meant here, as the apostle speaks of *all* the patriarchs, whom he had mentioned in the beginning of the chapter: and Abraham, who is one of those mentioned, is expressly said to have 'sojourned in the land of promise;' whilst, on the other hand, Abel, Enoch, and Noah (three of the patriarchs included in the word *all*,) had not received the promise of 'entering the land of Canaan.' So that some other promise, made in the first ages, and frequently repeated, must be that to which the apostle here alludes. And what promise can that be, but the promise of a future Redeemer made to Adam?" — the promise, that "the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head:" a promise, which was to be commemorated in the patriarchal and all succeeding sacrifices, "until the seed should come." Agreeably to this, the *Homily on Faith* applies this eleventh chapter of Hebrews, stating, that holy men of old, although they were not named Christian, yet exercised a Christian faith; seeking, as we do, all the benefits of God the Father, through the merits of his Son Jesus Christ; and differing from us only in this, that whereas "they looked when Christ should come, we be in the time when he is come."

To the fulfilment of this promise, then, was the faith of Abel directed; and the enjoined manifestation of this faith the apostle justifies us in pronouncing to have been the kind of sacrifice which he offered; and which, as being of the true nature of the sacrifice required of the faithful, procured from God that acceptance, and witnessing of his offerings, which was refused to Cain. See Heideg. *Hist. Patr. Exerc.* iii. § 52, tom. i. — Shuckf. *Connect.* vol. i. pp. 86, 87. — Kennic. *Two Dissert.* p. 212 — 215. and Edwards's *Survey of the various Methods*, pp. 99, 100. See also Witsius, (*Misc. Sac.* lib. ii. diss. ii. § 7 — 10,) who removes the objections brought by Spencer against the application of this chapter of Hebrews, here contended for; and Jen. *Jew. Ant.* vol. i. pp. 57 — 59, where some excellent remarks are to be found on the difficulty which the mention of Jephthah, in the catalogue of distinguished believers, might appear to create.

It must be confessed, that certain commentators, among whom are to be reckoned Grotius, Hammond, Le Clerc, Rosenmüller, and Primate Newcome also, if I rightly understand him, interpret the promises alluded to in this chapter as temporal; and are consequently reduced to the necessity of confining the expression, οὗτοι πάντες, *all these*, in the 13th verse, to *some* of those that had been named, or of referring it to *all* the descendants of Abraham, of whom mention had been made in the sentence immediately preceding. Now, it is obvious, as Whitby remarks, that *all* the descendants of Abraham did not die in faith: and how, on the other hand, any particular individuals of those before named can be selected by an expression, which comprehends *all*, it is not easy to discover. And if *all* who had been before named are referred to, (as is unavoidable,) then, as we have already seen, the promises cannot have been temporal, there being some to whom no temporal promises were made, as Abel and Enoch. As to the difficulty arising from the declaration, that the persons enumerated had *died in faith*, when it is known that Enoch did not die, but was translated; this is easily removed by considering, that the stress in this clause is not laid upon the death of those believers, but upon their having retained their faith through life, as is well marked in Hallet's paraphrase, quoted in the preceding page, and in the common use of language would naturally be conveyed in the words here used by the apostle. See Drusius, *in loc.* who supplies several instances of a similar latitude of expression in Scripture. Hallet, Doddridge, and Whitby, deserve to be consulted upon this entire chapter. They furnish a complete answer to the arguments of those who contend for a temporal promise.

I shall only add here an observation of Elsner, on the extravagant eagerness shewn by two of these commentators, Grotius and Le Clerc, in defence of the temporal solution. Having remarked, that Le Clerc condemns Hammond, for his mystical interpretation of the "city which has foundations," as implying an everlasting mansion in the heavens; and that he approves of the idea of Grotius, that Jerusalem was the city here intended: he exlcaims, "Mira est viri illius τῇ ὑποθέσει δουλεύοντος imprudentia: quomodo quæso exspectasse illam urbem Abrahamus dicetur, quam post multa demum sæcula posteris suis cessurum noverat a Deo edoctus? — quomodo deinde Deus conditor vocabitur Hierosolymæ terrestris? — denique infra, v. 16, cœlum esse illam urbem apparet, nam patria cœlestis vocatur. Simplicius quoque ad Epictetum, cap. xii. p. 77, in morte reperiri τὴν ἀληθινὴν πατρίδα dixit, de beatis sedibus." *Observat. Sacr.* tom. ii. p. 367.

No. LXIV. — Page 19. Col. 2.

ON THE PROBABLE TIME AND OCCASION OF THE INSTITUTION OF SACRIFICE.

The event which, according to the principle of sacrifice maintained in the page here referred to, gave birth to the establishment of the rite, seems obviously to determine the time of its institution. The commission of sin, and the promise of a Redeemer, being the grand objects of its reference, no period seems more fit for its appointment than that at which sin first entered, and the promise was first delivered; that is, the period immediately succeeding the Fall. And, indeed, the manner in which the first sacrifice recorded in Scripture is introduced in the narrative, strongly indicates the pre-existence of the rite; the words מקץ ימים, intimating (as Kennicott has shewn in the second of his *Two Diss.* p. 177 — 183.) a stated time for the performance of this duty: and the whole turn of phrase marking a previous and familiar observance. See Richie's *Peculiar Doctrines*, Part ii. § 42, vol. i. p. 138.

If, then, sacrifice be admitted to have been coeval with the Fall, every argument which has been adduced to prove that Abel offered sacrifices in obedience to the divine injunction, will apply with increased force to shew, that Adam must have done the same. Scripture also supplies additional confirmation, by the fact which it relates, of the first pair having been, by the express command of God, clothed with the skins of beasts. Much as some have endeavoured to depreciate the value of this fact, it will be found, when more closely examined, to supply a strong evidence on this head. That the beasts, whose skins were allotted for covering to our first parents, had been slain, it is natural to suppose; as it is not reasonable to think that any animals had died of themselves, so soon after their creation, and without having yet experienced any severities of climate or situation. Now, there were no purposes for which they could have been slain, unless those of food, sacrifice, or covering. That they were not slain for food, has been, it is hoped, sufficiently established in No. LII. Neither can it be admitted, that they were slain merely for covering; since it cannot be supposed, that Adam would, immediately after the sentence of the divine displeasure, have dared to kill God's creatures without his permission; nor is it likely, that God should order them to be slain solely for their skins, when man could have been supplied with sufficient covering from the hair and wool; and when, the flesh of the animal not being permitted for food, there must have been an unnecessary waste of the creatures. It follows, then, that they had been slain with a view to sacrifice. This alone supplies an adequate reason. The whole of the animal (if the offering be supposed a *holocaust*, as there is good reason to conclude all to have been,[1] until the Mosaic institution) would here be devoted to the uses of religion, except the skin, which would be employed for the purpose of clothing. And even this might not be without its moral and religious end, as it might serve to our first parents for a constant memorial of their transgression, of the death which it merited, and of the divine mercy by which that death was withheld. It seems also not unlikely, that from this institution was derived the appointment in Lev. vii. 8, that the priest should have the skin of the burnt-offering. See particularly, on the subject of this number, Kennic. *Two Diss.* pp. 67—70, 227, 228, and Wits. *Misc. Sacr.* lib. ii. diss. ii. § 12.—also Heideg. *Histor. Patr. Exercit.* v. § 16; Delan. *Rev. Exam.* vol. i. diss. viii. p. 99—103; Barringt. *Miscell. Sacr.* vol. iii. pp. 17. 67; Shuckf. *Connect.* vol. i. b. 2, pp. 80, 81; and Patr. and Ainsw. on Gen. iii. 21.

A translation, indeed, has been given of the passage in Gen. iii. 9, which subverts the entire of the argument derived from the skins given to the first pair for clothing, by referring the word עור to the skin of Adam and his wife, and reading it in this sense, "that God made for them coats, or coverings of *their* skin." Cloppenburg remarks, (*Sacrif. Patriarch. Sch.* p. 13,) that the word עור is never to be found in Scripture in any other signification, than that of the hide of an animal. Kennicott also concurs in this criticism, with one slight and conjectural exception. But the truth is, there are many exceptions, which these distinguished scholars must have hastily overlooked. Exod. xxxiv. 30; Job, x. 11; xix. 20, 26, with others which may be seen in Cocceius, Schindler, and Calasio, and need not be enumerated, supply examples as strong as that which has been noticed by Kennicott, from Exod. xxii. 26. But although the word is in these several instances applied to the human skin, yet the form and construction of the passage before us will not admit it here. It is here introduced absolutely, and without any of those connecting parts of speech which might mark its relation to the persons spoken of, whilst, in the passages above referred to, the relation is always so pointed out. On the supposition that the human skin is here meant, the last named passage, viz. Exod. xxii. 26, exactly corresponds to this, *the raiment for his skin*, in the one, agreeing precisely with the *covering for their skin*, in the other. But there the word has the preposition ל, and the pronoun suffixed to it, לעורו; in like manner, both of these, or at least the suffixed pronoun, (עורם,) would undoubtedly have been used here, had the skin of the persons covered been intended; whereas the word עור is introduced absolute and unconnected. See Kennic. *Two Dissert.* pp. 68, 69. Accordingly the LXX, and all the ancient versions, except the Chaldee, have uniformly rendered the sentence in its present received acceptation.

So little deserving of serious attention did the translation which has been here discussed appear to Dr Lardner, that, in his *Essay on the Mosaic Account*, &c. (Kippis's edit. vol. xi. pp. 239, 249,) when engaged in a direct examination of the subject, he does not condescend to notice it, at the same time that he observes upon Le Clerc's interpretation, which is scarcely less extraordinary: viz. that the word, כתנות, does not signify *coats*, but *tents:* so that the covering provided for Adam and his wife were not *coats*, but *tents*, of skins. In this, however, Le Clerc has nothing to support him but his own ingenuity of invention. The word כתונא, which is exactly the Greek χιτὼν, being never used to signify any thing but a garment. And even if it were, it seems rather extraordinary, as Kennicott remarks, that God should take care to make a tent or habitation for the first pair in Paradise, when, in the very next words, we read of God's turning them out of Paradise. This, however, is not the only instance in which Le Clerc has indulged an arbitrary fancy[2] in his *Comments on Scripture.*

---

[1] See p. 176; also No. LXVII.

[2] Whoever wishes to be satisfied of the levity of Le Clerc's occasional strictures on Scripture, may consult the dissertation of Witsius, on the *Author of the Pentateuch*, in his *Miscellanea Sacra*, (tom. i. p. 106—130,) in which he discusses, at considerable length and with much force, the objections urged by Le Clerc against the received opinion that the Pentateuch was the work of Moses. It is true, indeed, that Le Clerc afterwards retraced his steps, and, in the third dissertation of the *Prolegomena* of his commentary on the Old Testament, refuted the several objections which he had himself before advanced. The rashness, however, which, upon so important a subject, could have led to so wild a theory as this writer had set up, in opposition to the suffrage of all antiquity, to the authority of Christ and his apostles, and to the plain evidence of the thing itself, is not done away with, although its mischiefs may be mitigated, by his subsequent recantation. Having made mention of the objections raised against the authenticity of the five books of Moses, I think it right to direct the young reader, in addition to the dissertation of Witsius already noticed, to Bishop Watson's *Apology for the Bible in answer to Paine*, and to Dr Graves's *Lectures on the Pentateuch.*

No. LXV. — Page 20. Col. 1.

ON THE TRUE INTERPRETATION OF THE PASSAGE, GEN. iv. 7, CONTAINING GOD'S EXPOSTULATION WITH CAIN.

The plain, natural, and significant interpretation, which in the page here noticed has been given to a part of Scripture, which had long exercised, but to puzzle and perplex, the commentators, was first proposed by the learned Lightfoot, (see his *Works*, vol. ii. pp. 1085, 1243,) and has since been adopted by Kennicott (*Two Dissert.* pp. 216, 217,) and Pilkington, (*Remarks*, &c. p. 163.) The use of the word חטאת, *sin*, for a *sin-offering*, is so familiar that it can scarcely be necessary to adduce instances in proof of it. Examples of it may be seen in Exod. xxix. 14; xxx. 10; Levit. iv. 3, 21, 24, 29; vi. 25; 2 Kings, xii. 16; Ezek. xlv. 23; Hos. iv. 8, and in numerous other passages. On this idiom, see also what has been said in pp. 64, 65. of this work, and in Pilkington's *Remarks*, pp. 163, 164.

But the translation of the passage here given receives its strongest confirmation from the peculiar force of the word רבץ, which is connected with חטאת, and which strictly implies *couching*, or *lying down as a beast.* For this see Schindler and Castell on the word. And, indeed, all the commentators have been obliged to admit this sense of the phrase, even whilst they adopted a translation of the passage with which it seems but little consistent: the idea of *sin* lying *couched* at the door, being, to say the least of it, a bold image. Yet in this sense they have been compelled to apply the term. See Fagius, Vatablus, Clarius, Dathe, and Rosenmüller. But the word *sin-offering* being substituted for *sin*, the whole difficulty is removed, and the peculiar propriety of the term employed instantly appears.

There is yet another circumstance of some weight which is remarked by Parkhurst, and is also noticed by Castalio, Dathe, and Rosenmüller, although they have not drawn from it the natural inference; namely, that חטאת, which is feminine, is here connected with a word of the masculine gender, רבץ; which, as Parkhurst judiciously observes, is perfectly consistent, on the supposition that חטאת denotes a *sin-offering:* for then, according to a construction common in Hebrew, which refers the adjective not to the word, but to the thing understood by it, the masculine רבץ is here combined with the animal, which was to be the sin-offering. In conformity with this reasoning it will be found, that חטאת, in other parts of Scripture where it is used for a *sin-offering*, is, though feminine itself, connected with a masculine adjunct. See Exod. xxix. 14; Levit. iv. 21, 24; v. 9, and other places of Leviticus, where the masculine pronoun הוא is used instead of the feminine היא. But in Gen. xviii. 20; xx. 9; Exod. xxxii. 21, 30, and other places, where the word occurs in its original signification of *sin*, it has constantly the adjective connected in the feminine.

Dr Geddes was either not aware of this peculiarity, or did not choose to notice it, whilst he laboured so hard in his *Critical Remarks* (p. 54.) to shew, that there were no authorities to justify the connecting חטאת, a *feminine*, in its ordinary sense of *sin*, with a *masculine* adjunct. He has not taken the like pains to shew, that such a connection is unauthorized, in the application of the word in the sense of *sin-offering:* in which particular application it is, that this anomalous connection is specially contended for. He has merely contented himself with asserting, (p. 55,) that the rendering the word in this sense is liable to the same objections which he has urged against its application to the sense of *sin*. This he has *asserted;* whilst it will appear, upon a single glance, that, to every objection which he has advanced, this signification of the term supplies an immediate and satisfactory reply.

The principal difficulty attending the translation of the verse in question has arisen from the apparent want of connection between the concluding clause and those which go before. If, however, the context be well considered, the connection becomes clear and convincing. Of Cain, who was filled with rage at the preference given to his brother Abel by the acceptance of his sacrifice, whilst his own was rejected, Jehovah demands the reason of his anger: "If thou doest well," says he, "shalt thou not be accepted? (or rather, as the margin of our Bible reads, shalt thou not have the excellency, or exaltation, above thy brother, which thou conceivest to belong to thy birthright?) And if thou doest not well, a *sin-offering* lieth at thy very door, to make the due reconciliation, and restore thee to the station which thou hast lost by thy misconduct. So that in every way it depends upon thyself, that (thy brother) shall be rendered subject unto thee, and that thou shalt have the superiority over him." This meaning naturally and spontaneously flows from the literal rendering of the passage as it stands connected. "And the Lord said unto Cain, wherefore art thou wroth," &c. (with thy brother?) "Is there not, if thou doest well, exaltation; and, if thou doest not well, a *sin-offering* lying at thy door? And thus he may become subject to thee, and thou mayest have the dominion over him." It is apprehended that this, which is an exact translation of the original, affords, in the view of the above paraphrase, a clear, consistent, and satisfactory sense of a part of Scripture which has hitherto caused much trouble to interpreters.

The rendering by the LXX is so very different from this, and from the commonly received translation, that on the first view it would seem to have been derived from a Hebrew original, entirely dissimilar to that which we at present possess. It therefore will not be unacceptable to the curious reader, to shew how the Greek translators must have considered the text, in order to have derived from it a sense apparently so foreign from its import. They render it thus: *Οὐκ ἐὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, ἥμαρτες; ἡσύχασον· πρὸς σὲ γ᾿ ἀποϛροφὴ αὐτȣ͂, καὶ σὺ ἄρξεις αὐτȣ͂*: or, as in some of Holmes's various readings, — *ἐπιϛροφὴ αὐτȣ͂, καὶ σὺ αὐτȣ͂ ἄρξῃς.* "Though you may have rightly offered, yet if you have not rightly divided, have you not sinned? Be at rest. To you shall he submit himself, and you shall rule over him." Now, if in the original, תיטיב שאת be construed in connection, making שאת the infinitive mood, and expressing by תיטיב the mode in which the action denoted by that infinitive was performed; and if, in like manner, the words תיטיב לפתח be made to coalesce, whilst פתח is interpreted in the sense of dividing; if חטאת be considered as a verb, and רבץ also as a verb, with a stop preceding and following it, — the sense affixed by the Septuagint may be elicited. For then תיטיב שאת may be rendered *ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς*; and תיטיב לפתח, *ὀρθῶς διέλῃς*. חטאת also may be rendered by *ἥμαρτες*, and רבץ by *ἡσύχασον*. All this, however, it must be remembered, is to be considered rather possible than natural. For although the infinitive certainly admits such a connection with the verb תיטיב, as to imply the *doing well*[1] that which is expressed by the infinitive, yet the use of the verb שאת for *offering sacrifice*, and of פתח for *dividing*, can scarcely be said to be authorized by any passages in Scripture. Indeed that פתח should admit the sense of *dividing*, it ought to be written פתת, unless we suppose the word to be taken in the sense of *freely sharing*, or *imparting* (which פתח is not incapable of expressing) and that thence the Greek translators felt themselves justified in extending it to the above signification. As for רבץ, also, it is only by a considerable latitude of figurative application that it can be interpreted as in the Greek; its literal meaning being that of *lying down as an animal.* So that, upon the whole, the version by the LXX is rather to be defended than approved: whilst the translation by Jerome, and still more that by Theodotion, presents a view of the passage much more natural as well as grammatical.

Jerome's translation runs thus: "Nonne si bene egeris, demittetur tibi? Et si non bene egeris, ante fores peccatum tuum sedebit? Et ad te societas ejus: sed tu magis dominare ejus," (*Quæst. Hebr. in Genes.*) And this, again, is thus modified in the Roman Vulgate: — "Nonne si bene egeris, recipies? Sin autem male, statim in foribus peccatum aderit? Sed sub te erit appetitus ejus, et tu dominaberis illius." In both of these the sense is nearly the same as that in our common English Bibles; except that the last clause is applied by the followers of the Vulgate, not to Abel, but to the *sin* just before spoken of, and is interpreted as pronouncing on the full dominion of man over his sinful desires, and asserting the uncontrolled freedom[2] of his will. The Romish writers adduce Jerome's paraphrase[3] on the text, as clearly proving this to have been his view; and also refer to the authority of Augustine, who specifically argues the point thus, "Tu dominaberis illius; numquid fratris? absit. Cujus igitur nisi peccati?" On these authorities, together with that of the Jerusalem Targum, the Doway[4] translators

---

[1] Of this construction, Prov. xxx. 29; Psalm xxxiii. 3; Isaiah, xxiii. 16; Ezek. xxxiii. 32, and many other parts of Scripture, supply instances.

[2] Erasmus (*Hyperaspist. Diatrib.* ii. § 96) cites the passage thus: "Sub te erit appetitus tuus, et tu dominaberis illius;" and from this unauthorized reading deduces an argument in opposition to Luther, on the free will of man.

[3] In his *Questions on Genesis* he thus explains the text: "Quod si male egeris, illico peccatum ante vestibulum sedebit, et tali janitore comitaberis; verum, quia liberi arbitrii es, moneo ut non tibi peccatum, sed tu peccato domineris.'

[4] Ernesti, in his *Institutio Interpretis Novi Testamenti*, p. 79, exclaims, "Quam multi errores orti sunt in Ecclesiâ, ex linguæ Hebraicæ ignorantiâ! Doctrina de purgatorio, pœnitentia, fide, bonis operibus, et aliæ, ex Augustino quidem et versione Vulgatâ proferri quidem, sed adseri et defendi non possunt contra interpretem linguæ Hebraicæ gnarum." Other reasons, however, very different from mere ignorance of the Hebrew language, have been ascribed for the errors in Scripture interpretation, imputable to the advocates of the Church of Rome. Father Paul informs us, in one of his Letters, (Letter 25,) that the Pope, complaining of Fra. Fulgentio, said, "that preaching of the Scriptures is a suspicious thing; and that he who keeps close to the Scriptures, will ruin the Catholic faith." And again, (Letter 26,) the Pope is made to say of him, "that, indeed, he made some good sermons, but bad one withal; and that he insisted too much upon Scripture; which is a book, to which if any keep close, he will quite ruin the Catholic faith." And indeed, that the Pope had reason to complain of Fra. Fulgentio's sermons, must be admitted, when we find from Burnet's *Life of Bishop Bedell*, (p. 119,) that that father, in preaching on the words, "Have ye not read?" took occasion to tell the auditory, that if Christ were now to ask this question, all the answer they could make to it would be, "No, for they were not suffered to do it;" and thence proceeded to remonstrate, with the most animated zeal, against the restraint put on the use of the Scripture by the See of Rome.

In a work, which, within a few years, has obtained the most distinguished mark of approbation from the highest and most learned society of a nation holding communion with the Church of Rome, we meet with a detailed statement of those causes which have disqualified the votaries of that church for the task of Scripture interpretation. After an enumeration of the advantages derived to the literature and civilisation of Christendom from religious houses, as depositaries of the remains of ancient learning, the author thus proceeds: — "If the churchmen preground a triumph over the heretical (Protestant) versions, whose object in referring the clause to Abel and not to sin, they conceive to be that of escaping from the doctrine of free will; for the hostility to which doctrine, entertained by the first Reformers, they are branded by these translators with the title of Manichees. (See the *Doway Bible* on Gen. iv. 7.)

To these Romish doctors I leave a Romish doctor to reply. Dr Geddes, in his *Critical Remarks*, pp. 54, 55, has endeavoured to shew, that Jerome's version, or that of the Vulgate, cannot be maintained. He has not, however, adduced the arguments which bear most strongly against their interpretation; namely, those which apply to the mistranslation of the concluding clause of the seventh verse, and to the violence offered even to that mistranslation in pronouncing that Cain having sinned should acquire dominion over his sinful desires, which is as much as to say, that by yielding to sin a man acquires the power of controlling it. But too much has been said upon Romish exposition.[5]

---

served in this manner the faint tradition of knowledge, it must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that in their hands it more than once became dangerous, and was converted by its guardians to pernicious purposes. The domination of Rome, built upon a scaffolding of false historical proofs, had need of the assistance of those faithful auxiliaries, to employ on the one side their half knowledge to fascinate men's eyes, and on the other to prevent those eyes from perceiving the truth, and from becoming enlightened by the torch of criticism. The local usurpations of the clergy, in several places, were founded on similar claims, and had need of similar means for their preservation. It followed, therefore, both that the little knowledge permitted should be mixed with error, and that the nations should be carefully maintained in profound ignorance, favourable to superstition. Learning, as far as possible, was rendered inaccessible to the laity. The study of the ancient languages was represented as idolatrous and abominable. Above all, the reading of the Holy Scriptures, that sacred inheritance of all Christians, was severely interdicted. To read the Bible, without the permission of one's superiors, was a crime; to translate it into the vulgar tongue would have been a temerity worthy of the severest punishment. The Popes had, indeed, their reasons for preventing the word of Jesus Christ from reaching the people, and a direct communication from being established between the Gospel and the Christian. When it becomes necessary to keep in the shade objects as conspicuous as faith and public worship, it behoved the darkness to be universal and impenetrable." Villers's *Essay on the Reformation of Luther*, p. 88—90. The same writer, in another place, thus contrasts the characters of the Protestant and Romish Churches, as to their grounds of assent to sacred truths: — "The Church of Rome said, 'Submit, without examination, to authority.' The Protestant Church said, 'Examine, and submit only to thy own conviction.' The one commanded men to believe blindly; the other taught them, with the apostle, to reject the bad, and choose only that which is good." Ibid. p. 294. And when the Church of Rome was at length obliged, by the necessities of self-defence, to grant to her faithful sons the privilege of theological investigation, in what way does the same writer represent the system of studies permitted for this purpose? The theology of the Romanist, and that of the Protestant, he describes as "two worlds in opposite hemispheres, which have nothing common except the name." — "The Catholic theology rests," says he, "on the inflexible authority of the decisions of the Church, and therefore debars the man who studies it from all free exercise of his reason. It has preserved the jargon and all the barbarous appendages of the scholastic philosophy. We perceive in it the work of darkness of the monks of the tenth century. In short, the happiest thing which can befall him who has unfortunately learned it, is speedily to forget it. The Protestant theology, on the contrary, rests on a system of examination, on the unlimited use of reason. The most liberal exegesis opens for it the knowledge of sacred antiquity; criticism, that of the history of the Church; it regards the doctrinal part reduced to purity and simplicity, as only the body of religion, the positive form which it requires; and it is supported by philosophy in the examination of the laws of nature, of morality, and of the relations of men to the Divine Being. Whoever wishes to be instructed in history, in classical literature, and philosophy, can choose nothing better than a course of Protestant theology." Ibid. pp. 307, 308. Such are the observations contained in a work which has been distinguished by a prize, conferred by the National Institute of France.

Perhaps one of the most decisive proofs of the justice of this writer's remarks on the state of sacred literature in the Romish Church has been supplied by the late republication, in this country, of that wretched specimen of Scripture criticism, Ward's *Errata*. This powerless offspring of a feeble parent, which was supposed to have perished when it first saw the light above a century ago, has lately, upon signs of reanimation, been hailed in Ireland with shouts of joy. And the meagre abstract of Gregory Martin's *Discovery of the Manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures*, a work which has itself lain for two hundred years overwhelmed by confutation, has been received by the Romanists, of this part of the empire, with a gratulation that might well become the darkest ages of the Church. A work, condemning the Protestant translation of the Bible for using the term *messenger* instead of *angel*, (in Mal. ii. 7; iii. 1; Matth. xi. 10; Luke, vii. 27, &c.) by which the character of *angel* is withdrawn from the *priesthood*, and of a *sacrament* from *orders*: for not rendering the words (in Heb. xi. 21) προσεκύνησεν 'ΕΠΙ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάϐδου αὐτοῦ, as the Rhemish does, *adored the top of his rod*, and thereby surreptitiously removing one of the principal Scripture arguments for *image worship*: for, ascribing to the word פסל, in the second commandment, the meaning *graven image*, whilst the Rhemish renders it *graven thing*, which, with those who admit an *image* not to be a *thing*, will exempt images from the prohibition of the commandment: for not giving to the words μετάνοια and *pœnitentia*, the sense of *penance*, but merely assigning to them their true interpretation *repentance*, and thus doing wilful despite to the *sacrament* of *penance*: — a work, I say, condemning the Protestant translations of the Bible for these, and some other such errors; and in all cases demonstrating the error by one and the same irrefragable proof, — that the Romish version is the true one, and that the Protestant version, which differs from it, must consequently be false, — is certainly not such a one, as might, in the nineteenth century, be expected to be raked up by the clergy of a widely extended communion, and exhibited triumphantly as a master-piece of critical erudition. In the opinion of many, this miserable performance did not deserve an answer; especially as every argument which it contained, had been in former times repeatedly confuted. Perhaps, however, they judged more rightly, who thought, that even the weakest reasonings should be exposed, lest they might be imagined to be strong; and that even the most hackneyed arguments should be replied to, lest they might be conceived to be new. Accordingly, this work received an answer from Dr Ryan, whose zealous exertions in the cause of religious truth are well known, and is about to receive another from the Rev. Richard Grier, of Middleton. These gentlemen, at all events, display courage in their enterprise, since the author whom they attack, backed by the whole Council of Trent, has pronounced, that whoever shall not receive the books of Scripture, "as they are read in the Catholic (Romish) Church, and as they are in the Vulgate Latin edition, shall be *accursed*." *Errata*, p. 37.

[5] How little entitled the orthodox member of the Romish Church is, at this day, to expect serious consideration in the walks of sacred criticism, may be inferred (in addition to what has been said in the last note) from the description given of him by a doctor of his own communion. "The vulgar Papist rests his faith on the supposed infallibility of his church,

I come now to the translation by Theodotion, which, as it appears to me, does perfect justice to the original, and with which the version which I have proposed entirely coincides. *Οὐκ, ἀν ἀγαθῶς ποίῃς, δεκτὸν ; καὶ ἀν μὴ ἀγαθῶς ποίῃς, ἐπὶ θύρας ἁμαρτία ἐγκάθηται· καὶ πρός σε ὁρμὴ αὐτȣ̃, καὶ ἄρξεις αὐτȣ̃.* Here is an agreement in all its parts with the rendering which has been submitted ; the force of *ἁμαρτία*, like that of חטאת, extending to the *sin-offering: ἐγκάθηται*, as well as רבץ, denoting the *posture of an animal;* and *αὐτȣ̃* the masculine decidedly marking, that the reference in the last clause was, not to *ἁμαρτία*[6] but to Abel. See Theodot. *apud Montefalc.*

Grotius has given the passage somewhat of a different turn, and yet departs but little from the meaning which has been here assigned. He considers the force of the *si bene egeris*, as carried down to the concluding clause, so as to make the sense this: " If thou doest well, Abel, as the younger, shall be rendered subject to thy authority." And so makes the clause beginning with, " If thou doest not well," &c. parenthetical ; of which, he says, innumerable instances are to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures. This mode of translating the passage has been adopted by Purver in his English version ; and it is certainly not unworthy of commendation. At the same time, I cannot but think the view of the sentence, which I have offered to the reader, more grammatical, more consistent, and more natural.[7]

No. LXVI.—Page 20. Col. 1.

ON THE COMPARISON BETWEEN THE SACRIFICE OF ABEL AND THAT OF CHRIST.

Dr Richie judiciously observes, on this passage of Hebrews, that " it makes the sacrifice of Abel to have been of the piacular kind, by the comparison which it makes between the effect of it and that of the sacrifice of Christ, which without doubt was of the piacular kind. For, unless these two sacrifices had been of the same kind, and productive of similar effects, such a comparison could not have been made, nor the effect of the one pronounced to have been better, or much greater, than the effect of the other : causes of a different nature producing effects of a dissimilar kind : and between effects of a dissimilar kind, no such comparison as that here made being admissible." *Peculiar Doctrines of Revelation,* Part II. § xlii. p. 138.

---

although he knows not where that infallibility is lodged, nor in what it properly consists : it is to him a general, vague, indefinite idea, which he never thinks of analysing. He reads in his catechism, or is told by his catechist, that the Church cannot err in what she teaches ; and then he is told, that this unerring church is composed only of those who hold communion with the Bishop of Rome, and precisely believe as he and the bishops who are in communion with him believe. From that moment reason is set aside ; authority usurps its place, and implicit faith is the necessary consequence. He dares not even advance to the first step of Des Cartes's logic ; he dares not doubt : for in his table of sins, which he is obliged to confess, he finds doubting in matters of faith to be a grievous crime." Such is Dr Geddes's account of him whom he is pleased to call " the vulgar Papist ;" under which title he, in truth, means to include all who are sincere votaries of the Church of Rome, and whom that Church would acknowledge as such ; in other words, he means by this term to designate all who are actually within the pale of Popery.

And let it not be supposed that this is the testimony of an enemy in the disguise of a friend ; and that the author, whilst he assumed the name of Catholic, was influenced by the feelings of a Protestant. On the contrary, it is manifest, from the following passage, that his mind remained under the powerful influence of Romish impression, and that he continued still a partisan of that faith whose errors he affected to decry. For, says he, " Is the faith of the vulgar Protestant better founded ? He rests it on a book called the Holy Bible, which he believes to be the infallible word of God." And thus he pronounces the faith of the Protestant and of the Papist to be alike implicit and alike unfounded. " If the instructor of the Protestant be asked how he knows that the book which he puts into the hand of his catechumen is the infallible word of God, he cannot, like the priest, appeal to an unerring church ; he acknowledges no such guide ; and yet it is hard to conceive what other better argument he can use." He goes on even to pronounce, that, " in the Popish controversy, the Romanists have, on this point, the better side of the question ; called by some of their controversialists, *the question of questions.*" And in what way does their superiority appear upon this question of questions ? By " its never having been satisfactorily solved by the Romanists themselves ; they having always reasoned in what is termed a vicious circle ; proving the infallibility of the Church from the authority of Scripture, and the authority of Scripture from the Church's infallibility." (*Preface to Critical Remarks*, p. v.) This must undoubtedly have given the Romanists the better side of the question ; for what Protestant logician could successfully reply to such an argument ? But the reader must be wearied of this fatuity.

[6] That is, to *ἁμαρτία*, in the sense of *sin ;* in which sense alone it is that it has been by some made the subject of reference, in opposition to Abel. In the sense of *sin-offering*, it would, as we have seen, admit the masculine pronoun *αὐτȣ̃* : but to the word, taken in that sense, the reference of the pronoun would have no meaning.

[7] The note of Ludov. de Dieu on this passage deserves to be noticed. " An non, sive bene offeras, sive non bene, ad ostium peccatum cubat ? Quum scilicet, indigne ferret Cain, fratris sacrificium suo esse prælatum, quod non minus recte sacrificiorum ritus observasset fratre, neque quicquam, sive quoad rem oblatam, sive quoad externam offerendi rationem ac ceremoniam, dignius a fratre ac melius profectum esset, monet Deus, non esse hic ipsam oblationem respiciendum, recte ne ea secundum legem scilicet cerimonialem facta sit, an secus ; sed personam offerentem, dedita ne ea sit peccato, an non. Tu peccatum perpetuo circumfers, illudque in procinctu habes, cubans quippe ante fores ; itaque nihil refert, bene ne an male secundum rites legales offeras. Vel optima tua oblatio a peccato vitiatur. Non debebat appetitus tuus ferri ad peccatum, sed peccati appetitus ad te, sicut mulieris appetitus ad maritum cui subest, tuque ei dominari. Posset etiam verti, An non sive pulchrum quid adferas, sive non pulchrum," &c. *Animadv. in Vet. Test.* p. 13. These interpretations possess much ingenuity, but are liable to the grammatical objection already urged, of taking חטאת, in the sense of *sin*, in the masculine gender.

No. LXVII.—Page 20. Col. 2.

ON THE NATURE OF SACRIFICE BEFORE THE LAW: TENDING TO SHEW ITS CONFINEMENT TO ANIMAL SACRIFICE, EXCEPT IN THE CASE OF CAIN.

From the time of Abel's sacrifice to the giving of the law, we find the sacrificial offering described by no other appellation than that of עלה or זבח, the *holocaust* or burnt-offering, and the *zebach* or immolated victim. Thus we see the former expression used of the sacrifice of Noah in Gen. viii. 20, and again repeatedly applied to the sacrifice of Abraham in the twenty-second chapter. It is also employed by Moses in speaking of sacrifices to Pharaoh, in Exod. x. 25, and again in describing the offerings of Jethro, (xviii. 12.) The oblations of Job likewise, (Job, i. 5,) and of his friends, (xlii. 7, 8,) are so denominated: as are those of Balaam, in the twenty-third chapter of Numbers. In the numerous other instances of the mode of worship by sacrifice, which occur in this early period, the expression used is either זבח, or, where the sort of sacrifice is not exactly specified, a word immediately derived from, and clearly implying it, מזבח, which, though translated generally by us an *altar*, and being sometimes applied to that on which incense was presented, cannot, as Sykes remarks, (*Essay*, p. 246,) when used absolutely, and in its strict sense, be otherwise understood, than as signifying " that on which *slain animals* were offered."

Doctor Richie, indeed, not only maintains that none but animal sacrifices were offered from the time of Cain to the promulgation of the law, but that all during that period were none other than *holocausts*, or burnt-offerings; the *zebach*, or slain animal, having been uniformly offered up in that manner: and that, consequently, all the sacrifices of this early period were piacular. In this last position Sykes concurs, so far as to allow, that "all *holocausts* before the days of Moses were deprecations of wrath;" and he admits also, that, from the time of Abel until that of Jacob, there is no instance of any other sacrifice than the burnt-offering. But from his peculiar notions concerning the nature of sacrifice he is led to contend, that the sacrifice of Jacob, and those of Moses and Jethro, included a peace-offering, although he confesses, that in no one instance is there any mention expressly made of peace-offerings before the law.

The circumstances on which Sykes grounds his opinion are, — 1. The introduction of the word זבח: which is of no weight, because nothing prevents the *zebach* from having been an *holocaust*. — 2. The mention of the eating of bread at the time of the sacrifice: from which no inference can be drawn respecting the nature of the sacrifice, as we have already seen in Number XLIX. — And, 3. The mention of both the *zebach* and the *holocaust*, in the cases of Moses and Jethro, in Exod. x. 25, and xviii. 12: to which Richie has satisfactorily replied, by shewing that the particle ו, is to be taken, not in the sense of *and*, but in that of *even*. Indeed Dr Richie deserves particularly to be consulted on the whole of this subject. See *Pecul. Doctr.* Part II. § 42 — 49, vol. i. p. 137 — 144. See also Syke's *Essay*, p. 231 — 251; where, if allowance be made for the author's peculiar bias on the subject of sacrifice, considerable support will be found for the principal part of Dr Richie's positions. But, whether Dr Richie be well founded or not in his opinion, that all the oblations prior to the law, excepting that of Cain, were *holocausts*, this, at least, must be admitted, that they were animal sacrifices: more than which, the present argument does not require.

Josephus, it is to be observed, expressly describes the *holocaust* offered by Noah, as a sacrifice of deprecation. He states that this patriarch, under a persuasion that God had doomed mankind to destruction, and through terror of the repetition of the dreadful judgment he had so lately witnessed, offered up prayers and sacrifices to God, to "turn away his wrath." *Antiq. Jud.* Lib. I. cap. iv. This testimony of the Jewish historian, as to the received notions of the nature of sacrifice in his day, the reader will please to add to those which have been adduced in Number XXXIII. in reply to Dr Priestley's remarks upon that head. It will most naturally fall in at p. 75.

No. LXVIII. — Page 22. Col. 1.

ON THE DISPROPORTION BETWEEN THE EFFECTS OF THE MOSAIC AND THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICES.

On this subject particular attention should be paid to the observations in Numbers XXXI. XXXIV. XXXVI. and XXXVII.: especially to those contained in pp. 68, 69, and pp. 92, 93.

The following elucidation by the learned Grotius, whose unbiassed reflections are always valuable, deserves to be noticed: "Lex vetus dupliciter spectatur: aut carnaliter, aut spiritualiter. Carnaliter, quâ instrumentum fuit *πολιτείας, reipublicæ Judaicæ*. Spiritualiter, quâ *σκιὰν εἶχε τῶν μελλόντων, umbram habebat futurorum*. Heb. x. 1. Quod ad priorem considerationem attinet, sacrificia Legis expiatoria sanctificabant ad carnis puritatem, Heb. ix. 13. — Deus enim Rex Hebræorum (quoniam Legislatori licet suam legem, præsertim pœnalem, nonnihil relaxare) in quibusdam delictis victimas expiatorias admisit vice ipsius peccatoris, et per illas ac non aliter peccatorem a mortis pœna (quæ juxta carnalem sensum erat sanctio Legis) liberare voluit. — In quibusdam ergo delictis; quod ad pœnam carnalem attinebat, admittebatur placamen, redemptio, satisfactio, compensatio denique mortis bestiæ cum morte hominis alioqui debitâ.—Victimæ pro peccato ita in Veteri Fœdere peccata expiarunt; nimirum Deum movendo, ut pœnam carnalem remitteret, idque per satisfactionem quandam.

"Quod autem typi præstiterunt carnaliter, hoc *ὁ ἀντίτυπος*, exemplar, Christus præstat spiritualiter; et quod typi in quibusdam duntaxat delictis, id Christus in omnibus, Deum scilicet movendo, ut spiritualem pœnam remittat, idque per satisfactionem perfectissimam. Plus enim, non minus semper est in re typo designatâ, quam in typo; ut ratio monstrat. Commune est sacrificio expiatorio legali et sacrificio Christi illud, quod sine sanguinis effusione non fit remissio, Heb. ix. 22. Hanc impetrationem remissionis per sanguinem ibidem divinus scriptor appellat modo *ἁγιασμὸν, sanctificationem* (13,) modo *καθαρισμὸν, expiationem* (14, 22, 23.) Sed in Veteri Lege victimæ erant pecudes (12,) in hâc nostrâ Christus ipse non sacerdos tantum, sed et victima (14, 26.) Legalis illa expiatio hujus cœlestis sive spiritualis *ὑπόδειγμα* (23,) et *ἀντίτυπον*,[1] *exemplar* (24,) quomodo? Quia illa præstabat carni munditiem (14,) id est, reatus ablationem, non autem spiritui sive conscientiæ (9,) hæc autem ipsi conscientiæ (14.) Quia quod in Veteri Lege erat mors temporalis, hoc in Novo Fœdere est mors æterna, (Heb. x. 29:) ac proinde illic liberatio erat temporalis, hic vero *αἰώνιος λύτρωσις, æterna redemptio*, (Heb. ix. 12.) Quare sicut eodem loco ab effectu legalis victimæ ad effectum hujus per spiritum oblatæ argumentum producitur, *Quanto magis*, &c. sic et nobis licet hunc in modum certissime argumentari, — Victima legalis reatum carnalem sustulit, Deum movendo ad remissionem; ergo multo magis reatum spiritualem, Deum itidem ad remissionem movendo, tollit oblata per spiritum victima." — Grotii *Opera Theolog.* tom. iv. pp. 331 — 333.

The principles from which Grotius has derived his conclusion are manifestly these,—1. That the expiation wrought by the sacrifices under the law were typical of that effected by the death of Christ; 2. That in every type there must be something of the same general nature with that which is contained in the thing typified; and, 3. That, combined with this general correspondence between the type and the thing prefigured, there should exist that disproportion which might be expected between the shadow and the substance.

These principles, indeed, are so clearly and unequivocally laid down by the apostle in his Epistle to the Hebrews, that even the great fathers of the Socinian school, Faustus Socinus and Crellius, admit their evidence, and differ from Grotius only in the application. In establishing the correspondence and the disproportion of the Mosaic and the Christian expiation, they urge the reasoning of the apostle no less forcibly than Grotius has done, as may be seen in the treatise of Socinus *De Jes. Christ. Serv.* (*Opera*, tom. ii. pp. 157, 158,) and in Crellius's *Respons. ad Grot.* (*Opera*, tom. i. p. 204 — 211.) These expositors, not having been initiated into the convenient artifice so familiar to their followers, of rejecting the authority of an apostle when it made against them, found themselves compelled by the plain language of Scripture to acknowledge the validity of these principles.

The nature of their system, however, being at variance with their admission, they were led to strain one principle to an extreme, subversive of the other; and, by urging disproportion within the confines of dissimilitude, they were enabled to escape the bearings of that correspondence of the two dispensations which forms the foundation of the apostle's argument, and for which they had themselves in the first instance strenuously contended. For whilst, in professing to represent the expiation by the sacrifice of Christ as of a superior order to that effected by the sacrifices of the law, they endeavour to establish this by such a description of its nature, as divests it of every character which the Mosaic sacrifice possessed, they in truth shew, that the death of Christ bore no relation whatever to those sacrifices by which they admit it to have been typified; that is, in other words, they make the Mosaic sacrifices at the same time typical and not typical of the death of Christ. See this point well treated, though in a different manner, by Stillingfleet, in his *Discourse concerning the true Reasons*, &c. pp. 365 — 367.

On another fallacy in the reasoning of the above writers it is also necessary to remark. Whilst they profess faithfully to follow the apostle's reasoning in his address to the Hebrews, they represent the expiation of the legal sacrifice as wholly typical; whereas it was not less real and effectual, under its own proper system, than the sacrifice of Christ was under that by which it was succeeded; whilst, at the same time, it prefigured that more important expiation which was to be introduced under the new dispensation; all the parts of which, the apostle distinctly informs us, had their corresponding circumstances in that which went before.

Upon the whole, then, briefly to sum up the present subject. — The people of the Jews being placed under a peculiar polity, whereby they stood at the same time in a civil and a ritual relation to their divine Governor, their offences in these several relations exposed them to the inflictions appropriate to each. The mercy of the Legislator at the same time provided for them the means of expiation by sacrifice, whereby, in certain cases, the corporal punishment incurred by the violation of the civil law, and the legal impurities contracted by the neglect of the ritual institutions, might be done away. The entire system, however, being but preparatory for another by which it was to be superseded, was constituted in all its essential parts in such a manner as to be emblematical of that which it was intended to introduce; and the several parts of the one, consequently, adjusted by the same proportions which were to obtain in the other.

---

[1] Grotius has here used the word *antitype* improperly, and in a sense directly opposite to that in which he has just before properly applied the term.

Hence it follows, that the sacrifices under the temporal and ceremonial dispensation of the Law had a real efficacy in releasing those who were subjected to it from its temporal penalties and ceremonial disqualifications; in like manner as the one great sacrifice under the Gospel possesses the power to release mankind at large from the everlasting penalties of that spiritual law under which all men are bound, and to cleanse the conscience from those moral impurities which forbid all access to that holy Being, who is to be worshipped only in spirit and in truth. The expiation, then, under the old law, was no less real than that which it prefigured under the new, whilst it bore to the dispensation of which it was a part, the same proportion which that more perfect expiation by the death of Christ bears to the more perfect dispensation to which it appertains; the wisdom of the divine contrivance, in this as in the other branches of providential arrangement, rendering that which was complete and effectual for its own immediate purpose, at the same time introductory and subservient to other and more important objects.

Berriman, in treating of the typical interpretation of the law, although leaning a little too much to the notion of its being merely symbolical, places the parallelism and proportion of the two dispensations in a just and satisfactory light. "From what," he asks, "was the offender delivered by the legal sacrifices? Was it not from the temporal death, and the danger of being cut off from the congregation? And to what privilege was he restored or entitled? Was it not to the privilege of appearing before God, and joining in the public worship? What was the purifying or sanctification consequent upon such atonements? Was it not (as the apostle styles it) *the purifying of the flesh?* an outward and a transient efficacy, which could not reach to *purge their consciences from dead works?* And why was all this necessary to be often repeated, but because it had no solid or permanent effect, nor deserved to find acceptance of itself? But if we take it in a symbolical or typical point of view, then it leads us to acknowledge the benefit of Christ's redemption, and those invaluable privileges he has purchased for us. That temporal death, which was denounced by the law, will denote that everlasting punishment to which sinners are exposed as such. The legal impurity, which wanted to be cleansed, will denote the defilement and impurity of sin. The outward admission to the service of the temple, will denote our spiritual privilege of access unto God, as well in the present ordinances of his church, as in the future inheritance of his eternal kingdom. And all this being performed by the oblation of sacrifices, clean and perfect in their kind, will import our being 'redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot; who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, for a sweet-smelling savour, and entered not into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, that true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man, there to plead the merit of his sacrifice, and make for ever intercession for us.'" — *Boyle Lecture Sermons*, vol. iii. pp. 776, 777.

On the subject of this Number in general, there are some excellent remarks of Bishop Stillingfleet, to be found in his *Discourse concerning the true Reasons*, &c. pp. 315 — 318.

No. LXIX. — Page 22. Col. 1.

ON THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE SACRIFICIAL LANGUAGE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THAT EMPLOYED IN THE NEW TO DESCRIBE REDEMPTION BY THE DEATH OF CHRIST: AND THE ORIGINAL ADAPTATION OF THE FORMER TO THE SUBJECT OF THE LATTER.

If, indeed, it be considered, that the sacrifice of Christ was the great object held in view in the appointment of all preceding sacrifices, and that *these* were primarily designed as sacramental representations of *that*, it will follow, that in reference to it must the sacrificial terms have been originally framed: and that, therefore, when applied by the apostles to the death of Christ, they were adopted, not merely as being familiar to the Jews from their applications to the sin-offerings under the law, but because of their original adaptation to this one great sacrifice, in consequence of which they had been applied to the legal sacrifices ordained to represent it. For some valuable observations on this subject, see Holmes's *Four Tracts*, pp. 102, 103.

If this view of the matter be just, it then follows, that so far were the writers of the New Testament from employing the sacrificial terms in mere accommodation to Jewish notions, (an argument much insisted on by Dr Priestley, H. Taylor, and others, see p. 14, and pp. 68, 69,) that they must have used them as primarily belonging to the death of Christ, and as in strict accuracy more aptly characterizing the Christian sacrifice, than those sacrifices of typical import to which they had been applied under the law. From this also it might be expected, that a fuller light would now be thrown upon the nature of the Jewish sacrifice, and the true force and value of the sacrificial ceremonies and phrases be more perfectly understood. And this we find to be the case, the language of the New Testament on the subject of atonement being more precise and significant than that of the Old. Instances of this may be seen in pp. 69, 103, 104, and are not denied by the opponents of the doctrine of atonement, as has been already observed in the places referred to. Thus, then, we find the Old Testament and the New bestowing mutual elucidation on this head : the rites and terms of sacrifice in the Old exemplifying and describing the leading principles and fundamental notions of atonement ; and the more exact and perfect delineation of it in the New filling up the outline, and exhibiting the great work of our redemption in its genuine magnitude and beauty.

The train of reflection pursued in this Number leads me naturally to notice the opinions of Archbishop Tillotson, as connected with its subject. Nor is it without much regret that I find myself compelled to notice, for the express purpose of marking with condemnation, the opinions of a prelate, whose great talents and virtues have combined to shed so bright a lustre on the annals of the English Church. This distinguished writer,[1] having been forcibly impressed with the many visible traces of the doctrines and truths of revelation discoverable in the mythology and worship of the heathen world, was led to conclude, with a rashness little to be expected from such a man, that the Christian religion, whilst it was in its substance a most perfect institution, was yet, in condescension to the weakness of mankind, accommodated to the existing prejudices of the world, so far as was consistent with the honour of God, and its own great and valuable purposes. And accordingly, he maintains, that the doctrine of our redemption by the sacrifice of Christ had its origin in the notion of sacrifices entertained amongst the Pagans.

"This notion," he says, "of the expiation of sin, by sacrifices of one kind or other, seems to have obtained very early in the world ; and, among all other ways of divine worship, to have found the most universal reception in all times and places. And, indeed, a great part of the Jewish religion and worship was a plain condescension to the general apprehensions of men, concerning this way of appeasing the Deity by sacrifice : and the greatest part of the Pagan religion and worship was likewise founded upon the same notion and opinion, which, because it was so universal, seems to have had its original from the first parents of mankind, either immediately after the Creation, or after the Flood ; and from thence—I mean as to the substance of this notion—to have been derived and propagated to all their posterity. And with this general notion of mankind, whatever the ground or foundation of it might be, God was pleased so far to comply, as once for all to have a general atonement made for the sins of all mankind, by the sacrifice of his only Son." Tillotson's *Works*, vol. i. p. 440. For similar observations, see *Ib.* pp. 439, 446, 447, 451. And again, in vol. ii. p. 112, he states the matter thus : — that "with these notions, which had generally possessed mankind, God was pleased to comply so far, as, in the frame of the Jewish religion, (which was designed for a type of the more perfect institution of the Christian religion, and a preparation for it,) to appoint sacrifices to be slain and offered up for the sinner," &c. and that afterwards, in the dispensation of the Gospel, the same condescension to the apprehensions of mankind was likewise observed, as has been already stated.

Now, it is surely much to be lamented, that when this learned prelate had, upon a full examination of the case, been led to discover such a striking conformity between Paganism and Christianity, as must reduce the matter to this alternative, either that the Christian dispensation was framed in compliance with heathen prejudices, or that Paganism was a orruption of those oracles which conveyed nticipations of the Christian scheme; it is uch, I say, to be lamented, that he should ave been drawn into a conclusion so directly t variance with history and Scripture, when ne so powerfully sustained by both was im-ediately at hand.

---

[1] So highly was Tillotson esteemed as a writer by the celebrated Locke, that, in his treatise *Concerning Reading and Study for a Gentleman*, he specifically recommends the constant perusal of the works of that prelate, as a most useful exercise for the student who is desirous to acquire the talent of *perspicuity*. So very highly, indeed, did that most excellent judge of whatever is requisite to clearness of expression, rate the archbishop's endowments in this particular, that he has joined with him but one other writer in the English language, as exhibiting a just model for the acquisition of a perspicuous style. That writer is Chillingworth, whom he commends also for attainments of yet higher value. "Besides perspicuity," he says, "there must be also right reasoning; without which, perspicuity serves but to expose the speaker. And for the attaining of this, I should propose the constant reading of Chillingworth, who, by his example, will teach both perspicuity and the way of right reasoning, *better than any book that I know* ; and therefore will deserve to be read upon that account over and over again ; not to say any thing of his argument."—Locke's *Works*, vol. iv. p. 601.

Why I have so readily availed myself of the opportunity, afforded by this honourable testimony, of presenting Chillingworth to the more immediate notice of the student, at *this* period, and in *this* country, will not be difficult, upon reflection, to discover. Quære: Are Tillotson and Chillingworth, and writers of that manly stamp, those with whom the youth of the present day are most solicitous to converse, for the improvement of their reasoning and their style?

The stumbling-block to the archbishop, as n ingenious writer has justly remarked, was he supposition of a religion of nature,[2] prior o, and independent of, revelation. Hence rose the assumption, that the notion of ex-iation for sins by sacrifice, which he found o early and so universal, was the mere suggestion of human apprehensions; not deduced from any express revelation concerning "the Lamb of God slain," in degree and type, "from the foundation of the world;" not springing from any divine institution, ordained for the purpose of shewing forth Christ's death, until he should himself appear in the flesh, to fulfil all that was prefigured of him, and to take away sin, and put an end to sacrifice, by the one great sacrifice of himself.

Had the archbishop, as the same writer observes, reflected, that a religion or law of nature,[3] is a mere *ens rationis;* that the first parents of mankind were not left to the unassisted light of reason or nature, but were, from the beginning, fully instructed by their Creator in all things necessary for them to know; that, after their fall, the way and method of their salvation was, to a certain degree, made known to them; that all religious rites flowed from the same divine source, viz. the original revelation of the redemption of the world by the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ; that all the apprehensions and common prejudices of mankind, as they are called, were derived from the same fountain; that all, until the apostacy at Babel, had the same tongue, the same faith, the same Lord; that the heathen carried off from thence the same religious rites and ceremonies, and the same sentiments concerning God and his ways with man, which, by change of language, length of time, wantonness of imagination, perverseness of human nature, and subtlety of the devil, were reduced to that corrupted state of faith and practice in which our Saviour at his advent found them; and that, as already observed, from the first promise made to Adam, during the patriarchal and legal dispensations, all was Christianity in type and figure; so that Christianity was the first religion in the world, corrupted afterwards, indeed, by the Gentile, but preserved by the Jew in type, till Christ, the great Antitype, the reality and completion, came, — had he (this writer observes) pursued this train of thinking, he would have found the reverse of his conclusion to be the truth, namely, "that Christianity was not instituted in compliance with Paganism; but that Paganism was nothing else but the great truths of Christianity split and debased into a legend of fables, such as we meet with in their mythology."[4] — Speerman's *Letters to a Friend concerning the Septuagint Translation and the Heathen Mythology*, pp. 150, 151.

---

[2] One of the most singular theories ever devised on the bject of Natural Religion, is that of Bishop Warburton; hich I subjoin here the more readily, as it tends to shew to hat strange conceits even the greatest men may be carried, hen they attempt to be wise beyond what is written, and pre-ume to substitute their own conjectural reasonings for the solid uths of Revelation. Man, he contends, was created mortal, the immaterial as well as the material part of his nature, nmateriality simply being common to him with the whole nimal creation. But by God's breathing into his nostrils the *eath of life*, and thereby making him a *living soul*, the *life* in an was discriminated from the *life* in brutes; since by this t was communicated to his immaterial part a rational prin-ple, which, by making him responsible for his actions, must quire, according to the existing constitution of things, a *con-nuance of life*, and, consequently, a distinct existence of the ul after its separation from the body. In the state in which, cording to the bishop, the first couple were placed previous their admission into Paradise, they were subject only to the w of Natural Religion, the constituent parts of which religion ere discoverable by the efforts of the human understanding nassisted by divine instruction. On being advanced to the aradisiacal state, man became the subject of Revealed Reli-on; and, as the reward of his obedience to the positive recept attached to his new condition, *immortality*, (meaning ereby the perpetual duration and uninterrupted union of the dy and soul,) a quality which was altogether extraneous to is original nature, was placed within his reach by the *free ace* of God. The opportunity now afforded to him, of exalting is nature by the superinduced blessings of immortality, was st by his non-compliance with the condition: and at the me time the corruption, which his disobedience caused to that tional nature in which he had been made to resemble the vine image, degraded him to his first condition of mortality, d made him again liable to that total death, that complete nihilation to which his frame was originally subject. But, the intervention of Jesus Christ, man was not only restored the advantages of his original state, namely, the continuance the soul after the dissolution of the body, but he was also abled to obtain that immortality, which Adam by his obedi-ce might have secured; with this difference, however, that, the immortality procured by Christ, death is permitted to ve a temporary interruption to that existence and union of e soul and body, which, in the other case, would have been broken. But not only had the transgression occasioned a lapse into that state of mortality in which man had been iginally created, but it also threw him back into that subjec-on to natural religion in which he was at first placed. In this spensation of *Natural Religion*, which, according to Bishop arburton, was thus permitted to precede the dispensation of *race*, the aids and succours of virtue were not, however, accor-ng to his hypothesis, wanting; for, in his view of the subject, e light of revelation is by no means required to make known e efficacy of repentance, or the rewards of upright conduct. oth these points, he contends, are evidently manifest to the e of reason, tracing the connection that must subsist between e creature and his Maker. Such are the paradoxical, and, must be added, unscriptural sentiments, conveyed by this arned writer in the ninth book of the *Divine Legation*. They will be found well, though briefly, treated by Mr Pearson, in the first three sections of his *Critical Essay;* a work, of which I have already had occasion to speak, pp. 30, 133. Dr Graves, also, in the fourth section, part iii. of his *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, has made many valuable remarks, affecting, though not directly, these positions of the too ingenious bishop.

It ought not to pass unnoticed, that his lordship, in one of his Letters to his friend Dr Hurd, speaks of this his favourite theory, as intended "to confute the triumphant reasoning of unbelievers, particularly Tindal, who say redemption is a fable: for the only means of regaining God's *favour*, which they eternally confound with *immortality*, is that simple one which natural religion teaches, viz. *repentance.* To confute this, it was necessary to shew, that restoration to a *free gift*, and the recovery of a *claim*, were two very different things. The common answer was, that natural religion does *not* teach reconciliation on repentance; which, if it does not, it teaches nothing, or worse than nothing." Of Natural Religion, then, after all that Bishop Warburton has written about it, we have his full confession, that "if it does not teach the sufficiency of repentance, it teaches even worse than nothing." The opponent of the notion of Natural Religion may safely allow the matter to rest upon the ground on which the bishop has placed it. That God will accept repentance in compensation for obedience, nothing short of the Word of God can ever establish satisfactorily to any reasonable mind. The consequence of this position is supplied by the author of the *Divine Legation.*

[3] To him who would wish to see, how little the *Religion of Nature*, so far as it contains any thing truly valuable to man, is strictly entitled to that name, I would recommend the perusal of the preface to *The Religion of Jesus delineated.* The observations there contained, whilst they tend to shew, in animadverting upon *The Religion of Nature delineated*, how sadly deficient the scheme of natural religion is found, even at this day, although sketched by the hand of a master, and aided by the borrowed discoveries of revelation, at the same time clearly evince, that the promulger of the truths of what is called *natural religion*, in almost every case in which he advances any that are of importance to mankind, is, in reality, to be deemed, not Αὐτοδίδακτος, but Θεοδίδακτος. Of this, however, the fullest and most complete proof is to be derived from the invaluable work of Dr Ellis, in which he may be said to have demonstrated, *The knowledge of Divine Things* to be *from Revelation*, not *from Reason or Nature.* Leland has also abundantly established the *fact*, of the total insufficiency of human reason in religious concerns, by the view, which he has given, of the state of religion in the heathen world, in his work on *The Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation.* From Clarke's sixth and seventh prop. of his *Evidence of Natural and Revealed Religion*, although this author is disposed to attribute to the powers of reason rather more than their due share, the same inference may be deduced — especially from what is said, pp. 659—665, and 666—671, vol. ii. of his works. I should be guilty of injustice to an accomplished modern writer, if, on this subject, I permitted to pass unnoticed Dr Maltby's Thesis for his degree of B.D. contained in the volume of his *Illustrations of the Truth of the Christian Religion.* The following proposition, "Nequit per se humana ratio cognitione satis plenâ et certâ assequi, quo potissimum modo Deus sit

The writer who has made the above observations, and whose reasonings would not have been less valuable had they taken less tincture from the Hutchinsonian school, has endeavoured, and not without success, to establish the point last adverted to; namely, the derivation of the Pagan mythology from the divine revelations.

Tillotson's idea corresponds with that which was afterwards adopted by Spencer. For, since he admits the Jewish dispensation to have been typical of the Christian, the accommodation of the *Christian* scheme to Pagan prejudices, for which he contends, could only have been effected through the previous accommodation of the *Jewish* scheme to those prejudices; which, as we have seen in Number XLVII, falls in with the theory maintained by Spencer. And this theory, as we have seen in the same number, p. 127, is satisfactorily refuted by Shuckford, whose work on *The Sacred and Prophane History of the World connected*, goes to establish the direct contradictory of Spencer's position.[5] The arguments of Spencer are also successfully combated by Witsius in his *Ægyptiaca*: see likewise the same author's *Misc. Sacr.* Lib. I. Diss. i. pp. 429—437. Warburton confesses truly, that Spencer's work is but a paraphrase and comment on the third book of the *Moreh Nevochim* of Rabbi Maimondes; and, joining forces with Spencer[6]

---

colendus; quæ sint hominum officia; vita denique futura sit, necne, æterna," is there treated with a justness, a succinctness, a good taste, a correctness of style, and a strength of authority, which reflect honour upon its author as a divine, and as a scholar, and cannot fail to give satisfaction to the reader, who wishes to find the *substance* of what can be said upon this important question, compressed into the smallest compass, and in the best manner. The concluding observation, concerning such as at the present day repose on the sufficiency of reason for a knowledge of their duties, contains a truth, in which every reflecting mind must necessarily acquiesce. "Profecto eâdem, quâ veteres philosophi, caligine animi eorum sunt mersi: aut si quid melius sapiunt, id omne a Christianâ religione malâ fide mutuati sunt." (P. 355.) And, therefore, as the writer finally remarks, it is most devoutly to be desired, that the advocates for the all-sufficiency of reason would deeply imprint upon their minds this momentous maxim of the great Bacon: — "Causa vero et radix fere omnium malorum in scientiis ea una est, quod dum mentis humanæ vires falso miramur et extollimus, vera ejus auxilia non quæramus." (P. 359.)

[4] If this view of the case be a just one, we certainly might reasonably expect to find in the mythology of the ancients, in a much larger and more important sense, what Plutarch says of the Egyptian fables, ἀμυδρὰς τινὰς ἐμφάσεις τῆς ἀληθείας, *some faint and obscure resemblance of the truth.*

[5] The particular application of his arguments to Spencer's notion will be found briefly sketched in vol. i. pp. 313 — 317.

[6] How little Spencer deserved to have the support of Warburton, is not only manifest, from the whole scheme of his argument, in his great work *De Legibus Hebræorum*, (which is itself unsupported by true history, and has always been resorted to by infidel writers in order to wing their shafts more effectively against the Mosaic Revelation,) but may also be made to appear, more evidently and briefly, by the quotation of a single passage from this writer's *Discourse concerning Prodigies*. "It is," he says, "the nature of the soul to be greatly impressive to a persuasion of *parallels, equalities, similitudes*, in the frame and government of the world. This general temper of the soul easily inclines it to believe great and mighty changes in states, ushered in with the solemnity of some mighty and analogous changes in nature; and that all terrible evils are prefaced or attended with some prodigious and amazing alterations in the creation: — Hence perhaps it is, that we generally find great troubles and judgments on earth described, especially by persons *ecstatical, prophets and poets*, (whose speeches usually rather follow the *easy sense of the soul, than the rigid truth of things*,) by all the examples of horror and confusion in the frame of the creation. The Prophet David describes God's going forth to judgment thus: — 'The earth shook and trembled, the foundations also of the hills moved and were shaken,' " &c. (pp. 70—72.) Now, can it be any defence against this irreverent attack upon the prophets inspired by God, which charges them with indulging in *enthusiastic visions and expressions founded only in their own fancies, and not in the truth of things*; can it, I say, be deemed any defence to urge, as Warburton has done, that, "through his intention to the argument, he often expresses himself very *crudely*?" (*Div. Leg.* vol. ii. p. 341.) If he be so *crude* in his expression, as to cast discredit upon Revelation, whilst his intention is to support it, he must surely be a very unsafe guide in theology. At the same time, it can hardly be imagined, that an author, possessing considerable powers and facilities of language, could, in any case, especially in one affecting the very foundation of Revealed Religion, ex-

in maintaining the orthodoxy of the philosophizing Jew,[7] he contends, with all his might, against the arguments of Witsius and Shuckford.—*Div. Leg.* Book IV. sect. 6. To this he was urged by the necessity, which his paradoxical system had imposed upon him, of making out for the Egyptian rites and institutions an extravagant antiquity: and in defence of his dogmas he advances every thing that a powerful but perverted ingenuity, acting on a wide range of learning, could supply.[8]

Lord Bolingbroke has seldom been found instrumental in correcting theological mistakes, and yet nothing can be more apposite in reply to these dangerous notions of Tillotson, Spencer, and Warburton, than his observations upon this very subject. For the weighty reasons assigned by these writers, he says, (alluding to such as held the opinions of Spencer,)—"The God of truth chose to indulge error, and suited his institutions to the taste of the age: he contented himself also to take ordinary and natural means, in a case to which they were not adequate: and whilst miracles and divine interpositions were displayed in great abundance before the eyes of the Israelites, yet Moses, under the direction of the Almighty, chose to make use of superstitions which he did not want, and which defeated instead of securing his intent; insomuch that, if the apostacies of the Israelites, after such manifestations of the one true God, can be any way accounted for, it must be by the effect of the very expedient which had been employed to prevent those apostasies." In short, he says, the whole plan of Providence seems to have been, "to destroy idolatry by indulgence to the very superstitions out of which it grew." [9]—Bolingbroke's *Phil. Works*, vol. i. pp. 313—319.

What the noble Sophist had intended with no better will to Revealed Religion itself, than to those of its advocates whom he professes to rebuke, I have, in this extract, taken such liberties in modifying, as will permit the argument to bear only where truth would

---

press himself so *crudely*, as to represent himself destitute of a belief, which he *firmly*, *habitually*, and *reverently* maintained. At all events, it is evident, that such a writer is to be consulted with much caution, and his authorities scanned with much suspicion.

[7] For a very curious and interesting account of the circumstances which gave rise to the production of the celebrated work, the *Moreh Nevochim*, in which Maimonides first gave to the world the theory of the ceremonial institutions of the Jews here referred to, the reader may consult Warburton's *Div. Leg.* vol. ii. pp. 353, 354. He will probably, however, not be altogether satisfied, that the existing necessity of "shewing to the apostatizing Jews, that the Scriptures might be defended or even explained on the principles of Aristotle; and of gratifying the inquisitive and disputatious tendencies of those, who inquired after the *reasons* of the Jewish laws, by finding out a reasonableness and convenience in their ceremonial rites," supplies a proof, that those reasons, which the philosophic Jew had thus assigned, were the true reasons which influenced the divine Legislator in the several ordinances of his Law. The parallel, which Warburton here insinuates, between the nature of his own great work and that of Maimonides, will not escape the notice of the observing reader.

[8] The character of this distinguished scholar and divine, as it is portrayed by the hand of a master, I here willingly subjoin. "He was a man of vigorous faculties, a mind fervid and vehement, supplied by incessant and unlimited inquiry, with wonderful extent and variety of knowledge, which yet had not oppressed his imagination, nor clouded his perspicacity. To every work he brought a memory full fraught, with a fancy fertile of original combinations, and at once exerted the powers of the scholar, the reasoner, and the wit. But his knowledge was too multifarious to be always exact, and his pursuits were too eager to be always cautious. His abilities gave him a haughty confidence, which he disdained to conceal or mollify; and his impatience of opposition disposed him to treat his adversaries with such contemptuous superiority, as made his readers commonly his enemies, and excited against him the wishes of some who favoured his cause. He seems to have adopted the Roman emperor's determination, *oderint dum metuant;* he used no allurements of gentle language, but wished to compel rather than persuade. His style is copious without selection, and forcible without neatness: he took the words that presented themselves: his diction is coarse and impure, and his sentences are unmeasured."—*Johnson's Life of Pope.*

For a view of the character more favourable, but not more just, I would refer to that which Bishop Hurd, the uniform admirer and panegyrist of Warburton, has given in the life he has written of that prelate. His encomiums, on *The Divine Legation* especially, are overcharged; and the recollection that the cause of truth and of religion, no less than the reputation of his friend, was involved in the estimation of that important work, should have rendered his panegyric more qualified.

My friend Dr Graves, in his late excellent work on the *Pentateuch*, has sketched a portrait, which, for likeness of feature and justness of colouring, seems to me to merit a place in the neighbourhood of that which has been drawn by Johnson. Speaking of the *Divine Legation*, and having observed, that, "While its author lived, his splendid talents and extensive learning raised in his followers and defenders such enthusiastic admiration, that they could not perceive, or at least would not allow, that he had been in the smallest point erroneous: while the keenness of his controversial asperity, the loftiness of his literary pretensions, and the paradoxical form in which he too frequently chose to clothe his opinions, roused in his answers a zeal of opposition, which would sometimes yield him no credit for the discovery of any truth:" he then proceeds: "Time should now enable us to view him in his true light: in reasoning, sagacious yet precipitate; in criticism, ingenious but not unprejudiced; his comprehensive view sometimes embraced in the process of his inquiries too wide an extent; while his quick imagination sometimes led him to combine his arguments with too slight a connection. But when he directed, to any one grand point, his undivided and unprejudiced attention, he frequently diffused over it the radiance of genius, and discovered the recesses of truth. Happy, had his humility been equal to his talents, and had his temper been as calm and tolerant, as his understanding was luminous and penetrating. His researches would then have been conducted with more caution and impartiality, would have produced more unexceptionable conclusions, and had been attended with happier success." *Dr Graves's Lectures on the Pentateuch*, vol. ii. pp. 209—211.

[9] On the same subject, this writer, in another place, thus pointedly (though, as his custom is, irreverently) expresses himself. "In order to preserve the purity of his worship, the Deity is represented as prescribing to the Israelites a multitude of rites and ceremonies, founded in the superstitions of Egypt from which they were to be weaned; and he succeeded accordingly. They were never weaned entirely from all these superstitions: and the great merit of the law of Moses was teaching the people to adore one God, much as the idolatrous nations adored several. This may be called sanctifying Pagan rites and ceremonies, in theological language: but it is profaning the pure worship of God, in the language of common sense."—*Phil. Works*, vol. v. p. 375.

have directed it; namely, upon those mistaken interpreters of revelation, who depart from the written word of God, to follow the guidance of their own fancies in explaining the grounds and motives of the divine dispensations. Such it is impossible not to pronounce Tillotson, Spencer, and Warburton, to have been, on the particular subject now before us.

In how very different a manner we ought to pursue our inquiries, from that which these writers would propose, I have already endeavoured to enforce, pp. 18—21; also No. LXVII. and pp. 189—192. And how fully we are justified in so doing, will yet more satisfactorily appear, on consulting Dr Graves's *Lectures on the Pentateuch* (especially the two sections of Lect. vi. part iii.) and the *Eight Discourses on the Connection between the Old and New Testament;* in which latter work, the unity of the scheme of Redemption pervading the entire series of the divine dispensations, has been treated with much ability by Archdeacon Daubeny, whose opinions, upon so many important points, I am happy to find perfectly coincident with those which I have submitted to the public, throughout these pages, on the nature of the atonement.

To such as may be desirous to investigate more deeply the opinions of the three distinguished writers against whom I have found it necessary to contend in discussing the subject of the present Number, I recommend an attentive perusal of the tenth book of Eusebius's *Præparatio Evangelica:* — Book iii. chap v. of Stillingfleet's *Origines Sacræ:* — Bochart's *Geographia Sacra:* — Witsius's *Ægyptiaca:*—Winder's *History of Knowledge:* —Ellis's *Knowledge of Divine Things from Revelation,* (especially pp. 122—129:) —Nichols's *Conference with a Theist,* (particularly vol. i. pp. 290—308, and pp. 319, 320:) — Faber's *Horæ Mosaicæ:* and Dr Woodward's *Discourse on the Ancient Egyptians,*[10] (*Archæolog.* vol. iv.) Bishop Tomline, in his excellent *Elements of Christian Theology* (Part i. chap. i. pp. 37—48,) has admirably summed up the argument from the concurrence of profane tradition with the Mosaic history; deducing both from the common source of revelation, disguised, indeed, and disfigured in the one by allegories and fabulous conceits, but conveyed to us by the other in its pristine and uncorrupted purity. The laborious and valuable researches of Mr Bryant, Mr Maurice, and particularly Sir William Jones, have thrown new and powerful lights upon this important subject.

As to the searching, with a curious minuteness, into the resemblances which subsist between the Pagan mythologies and the great truths of the Jewish and Christian revelations, this may, undoubtedly, be carried too far. And I agree entirely with the learned and judicious Dr Nares, that we are not bound, in the proof of the authenticity of Revelation, to mark out its traces amidst the rubbish of absurd fables and disgusting mysteries, which compose the various religions of the heathen world. See Nares's *Bampton Lecture*, pp. 251, 252. And yet, since these resemblances have been employed, by the pen of infidelity, to overthrow Revelation, under the pretence, that the discoveries which we ascribe to it had been derived from Pagan mythology, it surely must be admitted, that such inquiries of the learned as tend to reverse this position possess no inconsiderable value. The engines designed for the destruction of Christianity, are hereby converted into instruments for its defence. The infidel, who laboured in the support of error, is thus rendered an auxiliary in the cause of truth. And it may, perhaps, not unfairly be viewed as a sort of providential retribution, that a Hume, a Bolingbroke, and a Voltaire,[11] should be pressed into the ranks with the champions of Revelation, and compelled to march in the triumphal procession which celebrates their own defeat.

The latest claim that has been set up in opposition to the Hebrew Scriptures, is on behalf of the sacred books of the Hindus. These, it has been pretended, evince not only the priority of the Indian records, but also, that Moses has borrowed from the Bráhmens much of what has been commonly ascribed to him as original, especially with regard to the creation of the world. The fallacy of such pretences has, indeed, of late years, been fully manifested by the valuable exertions of Sir William Jones, and those of his respectable fellow-labourers in the field of Indian literature. At the same time, it is to be lamented, that the admissions of that illustrious vindicator of the Hebrew writings, as well as those of Mr Maurice and others, respecting the antiquity of the Vedas, have been such as to furnish those who are desirous to pervert the truth with an opportunity of applying the produce of their meritorious labours to the prejudice of the Jewish records ; an opportunity which was not neglected.[12] The futility of the attempt was, happily, at once exposed by a few judicious observations in the *British Critic*, (vol. xvi. pp. 149, 150,) and has since received more ample refutation from the pens of Mr Faber, and Dr Nares, in their *Bampton Lecture* volumes. But, in truth, notwithstanding that, as has been abundantly proved, such admissions of the great antiquity of the Hindu records by no means justify an inference affecting the originality and priority of the Hebrew Scriptures, yet it is fairly to be questioned whether that antiquity has not been rated much above its real standard.

---

[10] An extract from this discourse I here subjoin, as particularly worthy of attention, in reply to the favourite theory of Spencer: — "Whatever might be the bent and dispositions of the Israelites, it was Moses's proper business to rectify them. He was not to indulge them in their fancies, but inform them of their duties, and direct them to what was fit, reasonable, and consistent with good morals and piety, though that happened to be never so much against their gusts and inclinations: which, accordingly, he every where did; and there are numerous instances of it through all his government of them. His doing otherwise might, indeed, have shewn a great deal of *policy*, but not near so much probity and goodness, as are discoverable through his whole conduct of this great people. I can very easily allow Dr Spencer, that this was the method that Mahomet, Apollonius Tyanæus, and some politicians have taken: nor will I enter into any contest with him, whether the devil makes use of the same in order to seduce mankind from the worship of God; all which he gives, I think, surely with a little too much looseness, as parallel instances in confirmation of his notion: but this I am mighty sure, Moses was on all occasions very far from it." Pp. 281, 282.— Spencer had justified these observations by his strange assertions. "In eo enim eluxit sapientia divina, quod antidotum e veneno faceret, et illis ipsis ceremoniis ad populi sui utilitatem, *quibus olim Diabolus* ad hominum perniciem uteretur." And again he cites this political axiom, *τὸ κακὸν εὖ κείμενον οὐκ ἔϛι κινητέον.*

[11] Volney is not, perhaps, of sufficient calibre to be ranked with the above-mentioned discoverers of moral and religious truths. And yet he has given specimens, which prove him not wholly unworthy of such society. He has, amongst many curious matters, *discovered*, that the mysterious birth of the Messiah signifies nothing more, than the *Sun rising in the constellation of Virgo;* that the twelve apostles are *the twelve signs of the Zodiac;* and that all "the pretended personages from Adam to Abraham, are mythological beings, *stars, constellations, countries.*" *Ruins*, pp. 348, 388, 389. — Of this work of Mr Volney, it has been well remarked by a learned writer, that it "is truly styled *The Ruins;* for that, agreeably to its title, it menaces destruction to every thing that has justly commanded the respect and veneration of man: as it would rob men of the inestimable blessings of peace and good order, of the endearing ties of social connection, and, consequently, of what constitutes both public and private happiness; and, by breaking the salutary restraints of religion, would banish peace from the human

The astronomical tables of the Hindus, it is well known, supply the only reasonable *data* from which to judge of their chronology: their habitual exaggerations rendering every other source of chronological information altogether chimerical; insomuch that Sir W. Jones pronounces, (in his *Dissertation on the Gods of Greece, Italy, and India,*) "that the comprehensive mind of an Indian chronologist has no limits ;" and at the same time proves his assertion by a number of the most extraordinary instances. Their astronomical calculations, therefore, having naturally become a subject of great curiosity and interest with men of science, the celebrated M. Bailly, in the year 1787, published, at Paris, a volume on *the Indian Astronomy,* in which he contended for its great antiquity, carrying it back to a period of more than three thousand years before the Christian era. This conclusion he founded upon the nature of certain of their astronomical tables; which, he contended, contained internal evidence that they had been formed from actual observation, and must therefore be carried up to so early a date as that of 3102 A. C. His reasoning upon this subject, in his elaborate *Traité de l'Astronomie Indienne et Orientale,* were followed by other astronomers, particularly by Professor Playfair in the second volume of the *Edinburgh Transactions,* in 1789; and the *Suryá Siddhantá,*[13] supposed to contain the most ancient astronomical treatise of the Indians, was also carried up to a very high date, not less than two thousand years before the Christian era.

That the reasonings, however, which led to both these conclusions, are erroneous, later discussions of the subject leave but little room for doubt. Mr Marsden, in an ingenious paper in the *Phil. Trans.* for 1790, had, without attempting to impeach M. Bailly's astronomical arguments, pointed out a satisfactory mode of accounting for the apparent antiquity of the Indian tables, by conceiving the computations to be founded, not upon a real, but an imaginary, conjunction of the planets, sought for as an epoch, and calculated retrospectively. The celebrated M. Laplace, again, after the most accurate mathematical investigation, has not only[14] pronounced upon the

---

breast, and spoil it of its firmest support in life, and surest consolation in death." And to this is most properly subjoined, that "its baleful influence is not confined to these alone: that it carries in itself the seeds of its *own* ruin and confusion ; and that it would almost require a volume to enumerate the contradictory and jarring atoms of which this chaos of confusion is composed." *An Enquiry into the Origin of the Constellations that compose the Zodiac*, p. 197.

Such are the judicious observations of a writer, whose learning has enabled him to overthrow the principal theories which have been erected by others upon the subject of which he treats ; and yet it has not prevented the writer himself from adding one more to the numerous instances that already existed, of the danger of adventuring into those visionary regions, in which fact supplies no solid footing, and fancy is the only guide.

[12] See the Advertisement prefixed to the fifth volume of the London edition of the *Asiatic Researches:* in which, after noticing the antiquity ascribed to the Vedas by the above Orientalists, the editors insidiously subjoin the following observation: — "We shall not take up your time, with a dissertation on the exact age of either the Hebrew or the Hindu Scriptures: both are ancient: let the reader judge. —Whether the Hindu Bráhmens borrowed from Moses, or Moses from the Hindu Bráhmens, is not our present inquiry," p. iv. The merit of these observations, it should be noticed, belongs exclusively to the London editors ; the *advertisement* being altogether a fabrication of theirs ; and no one part of it being to be found in the original Calcutta edition, of which this professes to be a faithful copy. Such is the use to which the pure gold of Sir W. Jones would be converted by these workers of base metal !

[13] Mr Davis, who was the translator of this most ancient of the *Sastras*, thinks that he finds in it sufficient *data*, from which, computing the diminution of the obliquity of the Ecliptic at the rate of $50''$ in a century, he can fairly infer the age of the work itself to be 3840 years ; thereby carrying it back more than 2000 years A. C. (*Asiatic Researches*, vol. ii. p. 238.) But, Professor Playfair, proceeding at a rate of computation, which he conceives more accurate, places the date of the work above 3000 years earlier than the Christian era. (*Edin. Trans.* vol. iv. p. 103.) He therefore thinks himself perfectly secure in adopting the interval of 2000 years A. C.: in which, also, he fortifies himself by the authority of Sir W. Jones. The demands, both of Mr Davis and Professor Playfair, must certainly be admitted to be modest, compared with that of the Hindus themselves ; who require of us to believe, that this book is 2,164,899 years old, having been at that distant period given by divine revelation.

[14] I cannot refrain from giving, at full length, the opinions

recent date of the tables, but has also pointed out two errors in the calculations from which M. Bailly deduced his results; and has clearly demonstrated the epoch in the tables, not to have been real, but fictitious. And, last of all, Mr Bentley seems completely to have settled the point, in his two most ingenious and learned papers, in the sixth and eighth volumes of the *Asiatic Researches*, in which he not only contends, that, from the principles of the Hindu astronomy, the recent date of the tables can be deduced; but that also, from authentic testimony, independent of all calculations, the age of the *Suryá Siddhantá* can be proved to be such, as not to carry the date of its composition farther back than the year 1068. In his endeavours to establish these points, he has not scrupled to pronounce M. Bailly and Professor Playfair to have been totally mistaken in their reasonings concerning the antiquity of the Indian astronomy; and to have proceeded upon an entire ignorance of the *principles* of the artificial system of the Hindus: the nature of which he states to consist in this, — that "certain points of time *back* are fixed upon as epochs, at which the planets are *assumed* to fall into a line of mean conjunction with the sun in the beginning of Aries; and that from the points of time so assumed as epochs, the Hindu astronomer carries on his calculations, as if they had been settled so by actual observation; and determines the mean annual motions, which he must employ in his system, from thence, as will give the positions of the planets in his own time, as near as he is able to determine the same by observation." (Vol. vi. p. 542.) — He then proceeds to shew by what means such fictitious epochs may be assumed, without incurring the danger of a perceptible variation from the real mean motions: and, upon the whole, he has fortified his argument in a way that renders it not easy to be shaken. The high authority of the names which Mr Bentley has to oppose on this subject, (Sir W. Jones himself having, as well as M. Bailly and Professor Playfair, maintained the antiquity of the Indian astronomy,) may occasion some delay to the reception of his opinions. But, from the proofs which have been advanced in their support, and from the additional lights to be expected upon this subject, there seems little reason to doubt that they will ere long be generally acquiesced in.

At all events, the main foundation, on which the extraordinary antiquity of the Indian records has been built, must be given up

---

and reasonings of so distinguished a mathematician as M. Laplace on a point of such vital moment, as that of the great antiquity which it has been the fashion to ascribe to the astronomical tables of the Hindus; and on a point, also, in which the opinions of a mathematician can alone have weight.

"Les tables Indiennes indiquent une astronomie plus perfectionnée; *mais tout porte à croire qu' elles ne sont pas d' une haut antiquité.* Ici, je m'éloigne à regret de l'opinion d'un savant illustre (M. Bailly,) qui, après avoir honoré sa carrière, par des travaux utiles aux sciences et à l'humanité, mourut victime de la plus sanguinaire tyrannie, opposant le calme et la dignité du juste au fureurs d'un peuple abusé, qui sous ses yeux même se fit un plaisir barbare d'apprêter son supplice. Les tables Indiennes ont deux époques principales, qui remontent, l'une à l'année 3102 avant l'ère Chrétienne, l'autre à 1491: ces époques sont liées par les moyens mouvemens du soleil, de la lune, et des planètes, de sorte que l'une d'elles est nécessairement fictive. L'auteur célèbre dont je viens de parler a cherché à établir, dans son traité de l'Astronomie Indienne, que la première de ces époques est fondée sur l'observation. *Malgré ses preuves*, exposées avec l'intérêt qu'il a su répandre sur les choses les plus abstraites, *je regarde comme très vraisemblable, que sette époque a été imaginée pour donner une commune origine dans le Zodaique aux mouvemens des corps célestes.* En effet, si, partant l'époque de 1491, on remonte, au moyen des tables Indiennes, à l'an 3102 avant l'ère Chrétienne; on trouve la conjonction générale du soleil, de la lune, et des planètes, que ces tables supposent: *mais cette conjonction trop différente du résultat de nos meilleures tables, pour avoir eu lieu, nous montre que l'époque à laquelle elle se rapporte n'est point appuyée sur les observations.* A la vérité, quelques élémens de l'astronomie Indienne semblent indiquer, qu'ils ont été déterminés même avant cette première époque; ainsi, l'équation du centre du soleil, qu'elle fixe à 2°,4173, n'a pû être de cette grandeur, que vers l'an 4300 avant l'ère Chrétienne. Mais, indépendamment des erreurs dont les déterminations des Indiens ont été susceptibles, on doit observer qu'ils n'ont considéré les inégalités du soleil et de la lune, que relativement aux éclipses dans lesquelles l'équation annuelle de la lune s'ajoute à l'équation du centre du soleil, et l'augmente d'environ 22′; ce qui est à-peu-près la différence de nos déterminations à celle des Indiens. Plusieurs élémens, tels que les équations du centre de Jupiter et de Mars, sont si différens dans les tables Indiennes de ce qu'ils devoient être à leur première époque, que l'on ne peut rien conclure des autres élémens en faveur de leur antiquité. *L'ensemble de ces tables, et surtout l'impossibilité de la conjonction quelles supposent à la même époque, prouvent au contraire qu'elles ont été construites, ou du moins rectifiées, dans des temps modernes*; ce que confirment les moyens mouvemens, qu'elles assignent à la lune, par rapport à son périgée, à ses nœuds, et au soleil; et *qui plus rapides que suivant Ptolémée, indiquent évidemment que la formation de ces tables est postérieure au temps de cet astronome;* car on a vu que ces trois mouvemens s'accélèrent de siècle en siècle."—*Exposition du Système du Monde*, pp. 293, 294.

Thus has M. Laplace, from the evidence which the tables themselves supply, not only overturned the prevailing notion of their great antiquity, but reduced their date even lower than the first century: since he places them lower than the age of Ptolemy, who lived until 161 A. D.

Having been led to make mention of this eminent mathematician, than whom a greater name has not arisen since the days of Newton, I cannot forbear noticing, as a matter of singular curiosity, the coincidence of a remarkable astronomical epoch, as fixed by his calculations, with the year in which Archbishop Usher has placed the creation of the world, according to the chronology of the Hebrew. The epoch is that of the coincidence of the greater axis of the earth's orbit with the line of the equinoxes, at which time the true and the mean equinox were the same. This M. Laplace computes to have taken place, about the year 4004 before the Christian era; which is the very era of the creation, as Chronologists have derived it from the Hebrew Scriptures. — *Traité de Mécanique Céleste*, tom. iii. p. 113. This point I have stated merely for the gratification of the curious reader, without intending to lay upon it any particular stress. At the same time, I cannot avoid observing, that if a coincidence, equally striking, bore an aspect unfavourable to the truth of the Scripture history, it would be cried up by a certain class of literati (who admire Mr Brydone's lavas and such like trash,) as a circumstance amounting to a *demonstration* of the falsehood of the Hebrew Scriptures.

as no longer tenable: and the decided priority of the Mosaic Scriptures cannot any longer reasonably be questioned.[15] So that, as the Chaldean, Phœnician, Egyptian, Grecian, and Chinese antiquities, which at different times have been deemed irreconcileable with the truth of Scripture history, have, to a more minute inspection, contracted their dimensions to a perfect agreement with the Scripture standard; so it may without hazard be pronounced of the Indian antiquities, that the day of their exaggerated extent has nearly gone by; and that there is no longer much danger of any serious impediment from that quarter to the belief of the Mosaic history. That the Indians did, at a very early age, cultivate astronomy, and that to them we are indebted for that most ingenious and useful invention of an arithmetical character, possessing at the same time an absolute and a local value, cannot, undoubtedly, be denied. And yet it must be admitted, that there are such indications of gross ignorance in the very science which they have so much studied, that one scarcely knows how to give them credit for certain other discoveries which are ascribed to them. To make the circumference of the earth amount to 2,456,000,000 British miles, (*Asiat. Research.* vol. v. art. 18,) and to hold the moon's distance from the earth to be greater than that of the sun,[16] are not proofs of any great progress in astronomical research. On this subject, see Montucla's observations, in the part referred to in the note below. In truth, from circumstances such as these, joined to the fact, of the Indians being unable to give any explanation of, or assign any reasons for, their particular tables and calculations, there seems good reason to think that much of what has been supposed to be their own invention, has been derived to them from other sources, as has proved to be the case with respect to the Chinese tables, and as Dr Nares has well shewn to be extremely probable with respect to those of the Indians likewise.[17] *Bampt. Lect.* pp. 270, 271.

As to the readiness of the Indians to impose fabrications upon the Europeans, all must now be tolerably well satisfied, since the publication of Mr Wilford's letter, in which he confesses, with a grief that had actually reduced him to a fit of sickness, that "his Pundits had totally deceived him, in almost all that he had written about the *Sacred Islands in the West;* having at different times, and in proportion as they became acquainted with his pursuits and his wishes, made *erasures* in the Sanscrit MSS. and on those *erasures* inserted the names, Rajata Dweep, for England, and Suvarna Dweep, for Ireland." He adds, also, that "those *frequently recurring erasures in most Indian* MSS. tended to throw a deep shade over their presumed authority." Another imposition, on a subject infinitely more important, has also since come to light. For, unfortunately, we find that the remarkable passage in the third volume of the *Researches*, which Sir W. Jones affirms to be an exact translation by himself, from an Indian MS. forwarded to him by Mr Wilford, relative to Noah, under the name of *Satyavarman*, and his three sons, *Sherma*, *Charma*, and *Jyapeti*, is altogether a forgery by the Bráhmens.

I cannot forbear annexing to this Number a passage from an old translation of a work of the celebrated Amyraut. It has a close connection with the principal topics under discussion; and the singular value of its contents will, I trust, justify its insertion.

"Furthermore, whereas it was well said by one, that things of greatest antiquity are best; and the philosophers themselves, when they treat concerning God and religion, extremely cry up antiquity, and attribute much to the dictates of their ancestors; as if nature itself had suggested to them, that there was a source of all these things, from which they, that were nearest it, drew the purest and sincerest waters; whereas, accordingly as they are derived through several minds, as so many several conduit pipes, they become corrupted and tincted with extraneous qualities, and contract impurity. If there be found a doctrine that has all the marks of antiquity, and there appears nothing in the world that equals it, it ought not to be doubted, but that the same proceeded from Him that is more ancient than all, as being Author of all things. If the language in which it was revealed be as the mother and stock, from which others, though very ancient, are sprung; if it describes the history of the world, and of men, and their propagation upon the earth; if it affords the demonstration of times, and that without it the knowledge of chronology would be more intricate than a labyrinth; if it deduces its history from point to point with an exact correspondence; if it clearly and certainly relates histories, that are as the body of the fabulous shadows that we see in the writings of the most ancient authors in the world; who will doubt, but all which they have is taken from thence, and that we ought to refer what is therein depraved and corrupted thereunto, as to its principle, and have recourse thither to learn what we are ignorant of? If there be found a religion, all whose parts accord together with an admirable harmony, although it has been propounded at several times, and by several persons, in several places; if there be a discipline, a doctrine, a book, a society, in which God himself speaks to men in a style and manner agreeable to the eminence of his majesty, displays his justness to them most terrible in its appearance, discovers his power in its highest magnificence, and gives them to sound the breadth and length, depth and height, of his infinite mercies: lastly, if examples of an incomparable virtue be found therein, with incitations and instructions to piety, such as are not to be paralleled any other where in the world, 'tis an indubitable argument, that they are proceeded from some other than the human mind, or the school of Man."

---

[15] Dr Nares, in his valuable note upon this subject, (*Bampton Lecture*, pp. 256—273,) seems somewhat reluctant to admit Mr Bentley's results, in opposition to those which could boast so many distinguished names in their support. He has, however, with great learning and ability, shewn, that even from the evidence which M. Bailly himself adduces in corroboration of his opinion, no inference can reasonably be drawn, which in any degree interferes with the truth and originality of the Scripture history. Indeed, the whole of Dr Nares's discussion of this subject is particularly worthy of attention. Of his entire work, it may be, as it has been, most truly affirmed, that there is perhaps no other extant, which, within the same compass, brings so much argument to bear against the various enemies of our religion from without, or against the betrayers of it from within. And, as compressing, in the best manner, the greatest quantity of important information on all the important subjects on which modern wisdom has attempted to assail Revelation, I most earnestly recommend it to the theological student. —I cannot permit the very favourable mention which this author has made of my former publications on *the Atonement* to prevent me from giving a testimony which the cause of religious truth so imperiously demands.

[16] "Ils font aussi la Lune plus éloignée de nous que le Soleil, et même ils sont aussi attachées à cette opinion, qu'on l'est encore dans certaines contrées à nier le mouvement de la terre. Un Brame et un missionaire étant dans la même prison, le premier suffroit assez patiemment, que l'autre entreprît de le désabuser du culte de *Brama;* mais lorsque, dans d'autres conversations, il vit que le missionaire prétendoit, que le Soleil étoit au-delà de la Lune, ç'en, fut fait; il rompit entièrement avec lui, et ne voulut plus lui parler."—Montuc. *Hist. des Mathêm.* tom. i. p. 404.

[17] Will not this supposition throw some light upon that extraordinary acquaintance with certain trigonometrical principles, laid down in the *Suryá Siddhantà*, which have excited Professor Playfair's wonder in *Edinb. Trans.* vol. iv.?

In referring to the authors who have illustrated the primary subjects of this Number, I ought not to omit the name of Mr Lloyd, who, in his valuable treatise on *Christian Theology*, has so justly propounded, and so impressively and eloquently enforced, the leading doctrines of the Christian religion. But that this Number has been already carried to an unreasonable length, I should add to it some extracts from his first and second chapters, which could not fail to enhance its value. From his remarks in the first chapter, (particularly pp. 6—10.) *On the proper provinces of Natural and Revealed Religion*, and from those in the second, *On the unity of divine truths displayed in the Jewish and Christian dispensations*, I can promise the judicious reader much satisfaction and instruction.

In bestowing upon Lord Bolingbroke the epithet of Sophist, in the preceding number, at p. 193, I feel, upon second thoughts, that I have not been strictly correct in the application of the term. Ingenuity, exerted under a subtle show of reasoning, for the purpose of misleading and overreaching the controversial opponent, is the distinguishing attribute of the character so denominated. His lordship, however, has not condescended to deal in this treacherous manner with those whom he combats in argument. His magnanimity and his candour are both at war with such mean and petty artifices. The one raises him above the little forms of logical and exact ratiocination, and the other inspires him with the disdain of concealing from his opponent any vulnerable part. His argument is, accordingly, of that elevated quality, that deals in lofty language and privileged assertion; and of that intrepid character, that fears not, as occasion may demand, to beat down the very positions, which, when other occasions demanded, it had been found convenient to maintain. The noble writer, in short, too courtly to associate with the antiquated followers of Aristotle, and too free to be trammelled by the rules of a precise and circumscribing dialectic, passes on fluently in one smooth and gentlemanly tenor, undisturbed by any want of connection between premises and conclusion, and at perfect liberty to relinquish either, or both, just as his lordly humour may happen to direct. To these ingenuous qualities, which exalt his lordship's *reasoning* above the pedantic exactnesses of *logic*, is superadded an easy freedom, which releases his lordship's *History* from the troublesome punctilios of fact. So that, upon the whole, there is scarcely any writer, who, in a flowing and copious vein of declamation, possesses, in any degree comparable to his lordship, the art of arriving at whatever conclusion he pleases, and by whatever route: not merely overwhelming the astonished adversary, by a rapid succession of movements the most unexpected, but displaying still greater argumentative powers, in overturning those very dogmas which had just before been rendered impregnable to all but himself, and thereby defeating the only antagonist worthy to be opposed to so illustrious a disputant.

To be serious, there is no writer of any name, Voltaire perhaps alone excepted, whose attempts upon Christianity are more impotent and contemptible than those of Lord Bolingbroke. The bare enumeration of the positions he has maintained, throughout his *Letters on History*, and what are called his *Philosophical Works*, would be an exposure of ignorance and imbecility, sufficient not merely to satisfy truth, but to satiate malice. It was, therefore, scarcely necessary that his deistical productions should have been submitted to the careful dissection of Clayton, Warner, and Leland, and the powerful and unmerciful lacerations of Warburton.[18] They must soon have done the work for themselves. Having little more than their impiety and their viciousness to recommend them, they must inevitably, excepting only with those to whom impiety and vice are a recommendation, have ere long reached that oblivion, to which, save only with such persons, they are now, I may say, almost universally consigned. On their first publication, it was proposed, as the best mode of counteracting their mischievous design, to collect the contradictory passages, and merely arranging them mutually confronted in opposing columns, so to leave them without comment to the reflections of the reader: and, if I mistake not, this idea was acted on by one writer, in a work, entitled an *Analysis of the Philosophical Works of the late Lord Bolingbroke.* This work I have not seen: but so exact a specimen of this nature is supplied by the very part of this writer's works, to which I have had, in the foregoing Number, occasion to refer, that I cannot refuse to produce it for the reader's satisfaction.

Being anxious to prove, in opposition to the received opinion, that the idolatries of the Gentile world could not have been derived from the corruptions of an original Revelation, he peremptorily asserts, that "it is *impossible* for any man in his senses to believe, that a tradition" (namely, that of the unity of God) "derived from God himself, through so few generations, was lost among the greatest part of mankind; or that Polytheism and Idolatry were established on the ruins of it, in the days of Serug, before those of Abraham, and so soon after the deluge." (*Philos. Works*, 8vo. Ed. vol. i. p. 299.) At the distance of less than two pages, we find it as peremptorily asserted, by the same extraordinary writer, that "Polytheism and Idolatry have the *closest connection* with the natures and affections of rude ignorant men:" and in less than half a page more, that "the vulgar embrace them easily, even after the true doctrine of a divine unity has been taught and received, as we may learn from the example of the Israelites: and that superstitions grow *apace*, and spread wide, even in those countries where Christianity has been established and is daily taught, as we may learn from the examples of the Roman churches," &c. But this is not all. We find this same writer again, in vol. ii. pp. 200—210, both deny the *fact*, that the divine unity had been taught to the Israelites and soon forgotten by them (which is the very *example* he builds upon in the above passage,) and also the *application* of that fact to the case of other nations (which application is the very use he has himself made of that fact,)—and then, after all this, and almost in the same breath in which he has made these assertions, he draws back again in part, and says, "I do not *so much deny* the truth of the facts, as I oppose their application," (p. 210.) That is,—(I cannot resist the recapitulation,)—our author first denies a certain fact as *impossible:* then establishes its strong *probability* upon general principles of human nature, supported by an *example* drawn from the case of the Israelites, and *applied* to that of mankind at large: then he both denies the truth of that very *example*, and the justness of its *application*, (both of which are his own undisputed property:) and then again he admits them both, in certain (but different) degrees; since he does *not so much deny the one, as he opposes the other.* What does all this mean? Is it, or is it not, nonsense? Have we not here, then, (to use the sort of pleasant and sportive phrase, that might not improbably have been used by such writers as his lordship,) in beating about for game, sprung a whole covey of contradictions, which, after winging their tortuous course in all directions, have at last sought shelter, by taking flight into the impenetrable thickets of nonsense? Now what is to be done with such a writer as this? The author of the memoirs of his life, whilst he speaks in terms much too strong of his qualities as a statesman, remarks, in alluding to the excursions which, as an author, he had ventured to make beyond his proper sphere: "I should be sorry, that you took your politics from priests; but I should be in more pain if I thought you in danger of receiving your religion from a politician." *Memoirs of the Life of Lord Bolingbroke*, p. 232.

In truth, to sum up all in a word, my Lord Bolingbroke was no more than a coxcomb in literature, and a pretender in science. Nor has religion, though the principal object of his hostility, so much to complain of his bungling attempts as philosophy: at the same time that both have experienced more of malevolence, than injury, at his hands. With him, the great sages of antiquity have been as much the objects of lordly contempt, as the prophets and apostles; and the maxims of ancient wisdom have been held as cheap as the established doctrines of Revelation. Whatever, in short, is not Lord Bolingbroke, is not sense. All, whether ancient or modern, who have trod the same ground before him, historians, chronologists, moralists, philosphers, divines, all are either blockheads or impostors. And even Locke and Newton dwindle into drivellers, where they have presumed to meddle with those subjects, which the viscount condescends to illustrate.—(*Phil. Works*, vol. ii. Essay 3. ubique, especially p. 160.)

---

[18] See the *View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy in Four Letters to a Friend*, in which all that fervid vigour and burning severity, for which its author is so distinguished, are overpoweringly exerted for the purpose of laying bare to the public eye the miserable deficiencies of his lordship, as a philosophical writer, under the several heads of *ingenuity*, of *truth*, of *consistency*, of *learning*, and of *reasoning*.

The treatment which the truly wise and learned, both of ancient and modern times, constantly receive at his lordship's hands, naturally calls to mind the sarcasm of Crito in Berkeley's *Alciphron.* "I tell you, Euphranor, that Plato and Tully might perhaps make a figure in Athens or Rome: but were they to revive in our days, they would pass but for underbred pedants, there being at most coffee-houses in London several able men who could convince them they knew nothing, in what they are valued so much for, morals and politics." And Lysicles immediately subjoins, "How many long-headed men do I know, both in the court-end and the city, with five times Plato's sense, who care not one straw, what notions their sons have of God or virtue!"—Berkeley's *Works*, vol. i. pp. 369, 370. The versatility, also, with which this noble writer can, at one time, affect grave and learned research, and at another, as it may suit his purpose, profess to hold all such pedantic argumentation in contempt, is most happily illustrated, in the same admirable treatise, by the picture which is there drawn, of the Proteus shiftings and modifications of the free-thinking tribe. "When one of these has got a ring of disciples around him, his method is, to exclaim against prejudice, and recommend thinking and reasoning; giving to understand that himself is a man of deep researches and close argument, one who examines impartially and concludes warily. The same man, in other company, if he chance to be pressed with reason, shall laugh at logic, and assume the lazy supine airs of a fine gentleman, a wit, a railleur, to avoid the dryness of a regular and exact inquiry. This double face of the minute philosopher, is of no small use to propagate and maintain his notions. Though to me it seems a plain case, that if a fine gentleman will shake off all authority, and appeal from religion to reason, unto reason he must go." (Pp. 460, 461.) But the truth is, as the same writer again remarks, (p. 639,) "that in the present age thinking is more talked of but less practised than in ancient times; and that, since the revival of learning, men have read much and wrote much, but thought (comparatively) little: insomuch that, with us, to think closely and justly is the least part of a learned man, and none at all of a polite man. The free-thinkers, indeed, make great pretensions to thinking, and yet they shew but little exactness in it. A lively man, and what the world calls a man of sense, are often destitute of this talent, which is not a mere gift of nature, but must be improved and perfected by much attention and exercise on very different subjects; a thing of more pains and time than the hasty men of parts in our age care to take."

What time our man of parts employed for this purpose, may easily be inferred from the circumstance, of his having commenced his philosophical investigations at the age of forty, after a youth revelled in the most voluptuous and dissipating enjoyments, and a manhood distracted by the most tumultuous political agitations. But it is full time to have done with him: I shall therefore only add to what I have said upon so unworthy a subject, by referring the reader, who can have any curiosity to know more of such a man, to the characters that have been given of him, by Chesterfield and by Blair. The latter concludes a very qualified commendation of his style, by observing, that in his matter there is "hardly any thing to commend; that in his reasonings, for the most part, he is flimsy and false: in his political writings, factious; in what he calls his philosophical ones, irreligious and sophistical in the highest degree." —Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric*, vol. i. Lect. xix. p. 282. See also the observations in Lect. xv. p. 211, of the same volume. The former gives such an account of him, upon the whole, as must be edifying to the young reader particularly; who will thereby be completely let into the secret of such men, by one of themselves; and will have the benefit of observing how much even a libertine, when in cold blood, can be shocked by libertinism. One or two passages I cannot avoid transcribing, as proving how greatly, even from the testimony of his warmest admirer, Lord Bolingbroke is found deficient in every thing that is truly valuable, either in a philosopher or in a man. His noble panegyrist, in recommending to his son to study the manner, that would best enable him "to seduce and to impose," proposes to him Lord Bolingbroke's style and mode of writing, for his imitation, in direct opposition to works of learning and sound reasoning, which he particularly decries: and, after pressing upon him, again and again, the repeated perusal of Lord Bolingbroke's writings, he assigns as his reason for so doing, that he wishes him "to lay aside all thoughts of all that dull fellows call *solid*, and exert his utmost care to acquire what people of fashion call *shining*."—Chest. *Letters*, vol. iii. p. 151. And in another place, where he speaks of the whole of that unhappy lord's character, he is obliged, though with much softening, to describe him as "a most mortifying instance of the violence of human passions, and of the weakness of" (what he chooses to call) "the most exalted human reason."—"His youth," he says, "was distinguished by all the tumult and storm of pleasures, in which he most licentiously triumphed, disdaining all decorum. His fine imagination has often been heated and exhausted with his body, in celebrating and deifying the prostitute of the night; and his convivial joys were pushed to all the extravagancy of frantic Bacchanals. Those passions were interrupted but by a stronger, ambition. The former impaired both his constitution and his character, but the latter destroyed both his fortune and his reputation." Vol. ii. p. 328.

Such was the Pythagorean institution of this great philosopher, who was to be qualified, by these intense lucubrations, to communicate new lights to mankind, and to improve the world by a juster set of notions in morals and philosophy. The noble characterizer, after glossing over these hideous enormities, and contrasting with them what he is pleased to represent as splendid qualities, is compelled, after all, to conclude, in words no less applicable to the insincere and unprincipled writer, than to his subject: "Upon the whole, of this extraordinary man, what can we say, but, Alas, poor human nature!"—Poor, indeed, when it presumptuously rejects those aids which Heaven designed to minister to its weakness, and to rectify its corruption.

In a course of observations, in which I have insensibly been drawn to enlarge at so much length, upon the subjects of free-thinking and scepticism, it is impossible to forget David Hume. The ideas suggested in the progress of it bring into view, by necessary association, this chief of modern sophists; who, whether the precedence be determined by the boldness of impiety, the contempt of truth, the perplexities of disputation, or the inconsistencies and contradictions in reasoning,—is undoubtedly entitled to the first place in the list of British infidels. The leading subject also of the discussion, in which we are at present engaged, naturally summons him to our tribunal. For, as his philosophic forerunner, Bolingbroke, has bestowed much unprofitable labour on the questions of polytheism and the divine unity, the same questions solicit the minutest investigations of this author, especially in his treatise upon the *Natural History of Religion*;[19] a title, which, as has been remarked, contains a form of expression much as proper as if he had spoken of the *Moral History of Meteors*. And here, having positively pronounced, that "Polytheism must have been the first and most ancient" (which certainly may be admitted, if it was the first) "religion of mankind," (*Essays*, vol. ii. p. 402:) and having affirmed it to be an incontestable fact, that about seventeen hundred years back all mankind were Polytheists, (p. 403;) and that, as far as history reaches, mankind appear universally to have been Polytheists; at the same time that he does not pretend to be ignorant, that about seventeen hundred years back, there was in existence such a book as the Old Testament, and such a history as that of Josephus; and that he himself informs us, (p. 433,) that it appears from Herodotus, that "the Getæ were genuine Theists and Unitarians:"—having, I say, thus dogmatized as became a sceptic, and falsified as became an historian, he proceeds, in a manner perfectly his own, to shew what never had been dreamt of before, not even in the craziest reveries of a Bolingbroke, that the notion of the Divine Unity had sprung up from the blundering conceptions of the vulgar, and that it demanded the reasoning powers of the philosophers to restore again the old system of a *plurality of Gods!*

This will hardly be credited. Let the reader therefore turn to the precious original, (p. 435,) where he will find the manner fully described, in which this notion takes its rise amongst the vulgar; for of these it is that he has been speaking throughout the preceding page. "Men's exaggerated praises and compliments still swell their idea upon them; and elevating their deities to the utmost bounds of perfection, at last beget the attributes of unity and infinity, simplicity and spirituality." Thus, then, the one, infinite, uncompounded, and spiritual first Cause, springs, as we see, out of the tendencies of the vulgar to praise and panegyric. But, immediately after, we find, that this is a height too giddy for those who have thus risen to it, and that it is necessary that they should be quietly let down again to the firmer and more peaceful footing of Polytheism. For, "such refined ideas being somewhat disproportioned to vulgar comprehension," (although having grown naturally out of vulgar conception,) "remain not long in their original purity; but require to be supported by the notion of inferior mediators or subordinate agents, which interpose between mankind and their supreme Deity. These demi-gods, or middle beings, partaking more of human nature, and being more familiar to us, become the chief objects of devotion, and gradually recal that idolatry which had been formerly banished by the ardent prayers and panegyrics of timorous, indigent mortals."—

---

[19] On this treatise Warburton makes the following observations, in a letter to his friend Hurd:—"The Essay is to establish an atheistic naturalism, like Bolingbroke; and he goes upon one of Bolingbroke's capital arguments, that idolatry and polytheism were before the worship of the one God. It is full of absurdities. They say this man has several moral qualities. It may be so. But there are vices of the mind as well as body; and a wickeder heart, and more determined to do public mischief, I think, I never knew."—*Letters of a late eminent Prelate*, p. 239.

See also pp. 429, 430, or rather the whole of the extraordinary reasoning upon this subject in the sixth, seventh, and eighth sections.—Thus, then, we see, that the vulgar, in their high flights of praise and panegyric, rose to the discovery of a first Cause; while a set of wiser men[20] we must suppose called in to restore the mob of middle deities to their pristine honours, since the purpose is to suit the objects of worship to vulgar comprehensions. And so we find, that, under the direction of the wonder-working χορηγὸς, the philosophers and the people are made at once to change sides, and act each other's parts; the people taking to themselves the discovery of the first Cause, and the philosophers, in return, the discovery of demi-gods and middle beings. Unless, indeed, as Bishop Hurd says, the people are supposed to have done both; "discovered the unity in their blind, timorous, and indigent state; and, when they were so well informed, struck out, in a lucky moment, their gross system of Polytheism."[21] On this, and the whole monstrous assemblage of falsehoods, inconsistencies, and nonsense, with which this extraordinary *Essay*[22] is stuffed, I would refer the young reader to the *Remarks on* Mr David Hume's *Essay on the Natural History of Religion*, in which[23] Dr Hurd has so successfully employed the weapons, with which his friend Warburton had, just before, transfixed the brother-infidel, Bolingbroke.

Yet such writers as these, such writers as Hume and Bolingbroke, (at least until their ignorance, falsehood, and absurdities, had become sufficiently notorious to expose their followers to the like imputations,) it had been the fashion to extol and admire. How such writers could ever have obtained followers, may at first sight, indeed, appear difficult to explain. The difficulty, however, admits a satisfactory solution; and one which has been so justly given by a late respected writer, that I shall content myself with the mere repetition of what he has said upon the subject. Having remarked, that, in his *Treatise of Human Nature*, Mr Hume's vain love of singularity had led him to endeavour to involve even the fundamental principles of geometry in confusion; but that, finding it impossible by his paradoxes on such a subject to rouse the attention of the public, he turned himself to moral paradoxes; this writer goes on to shew, that Mr Hume in doing so had calculated rightly, for that these, "when men begin to look about for arguments in vindication of impiety, debauchery, and injustice, become wonderfully interesting, and can hardly fail of a powerful and numerous patronage. The corrupt judge; the prostituted courtier; the statesman, who enriches himself by the plunder and blood of his coun-

---

[12] In truth, Mr Hume himself seems entitled to rank amongst those *wiser men*, as he has been able to discover many advantages in the scheme of polytheism. "For," he says, "if we examine, without prejudice, the ancient heathen mythology. as contained in the poets, we shall not discover in it any such monstrous absurdity as we may at first be apt to apprehend. Where is the difficulty in conceiving, that the same powers or principles, whatever they were, which formed this visible world, men and animals, produced also a species of intelligent creatures of more refined substance, and greater authority than the rest? That these creatures may be capricious, revengeful, passionate, voluptuous, is easily conceived; nor is any circumstance more apt among ourselves to engender such vices than the licence of absolute authority. And, in short, the whole mythological system is so natural, that, in the variety of planets and worlds contained in this universe, it seems more than probable, that somewhere or other it is really carried into execution." *Essays*, vol. ii. p. 242. Thus, the cautious investigator, whose scepticism will not yield to the proofs of the existence of *one* God, sees no difficulty in admitting it as more than probable that there are *many*. In this system of polytheism, also, our philosopher finds many advantages. For "where the Deity is represented as infinitely superior to mankind, this belief, though altogether just, when joined with superstitious terrors, is apt to sink the human mind in the lowest submission and abasement, and to represent the monkish virtues of mortification, penance, humility, and passive suffering, as the only qualities which are acceptable to him. But where the gods are conceived to be only a little superior to mankind, and to have been many of them advanced from that inferior rank, we are more at our ease in our addresses to them, and may even, without profaneness, aspire sometimes to a rivalship and emulation of them; hence activity, spirit, courage, magnanimity, love of liberty, and all the virtues which aggrandize a people." *Ibid.* p. 440. Our author has forgotten to add, that in our aspirings to a rivalship with these nearer gods, that he proposes as the objects of our addresses, we might rise also to that capriciousness, revengefulness, passionateness, voluptuousness, and other such qualities with which he has been pleased to invest them, and which qualities seem in the view of himself and Mr Gibbon to be the principal ingredients in that "elegant mythology," which they would so strongly recommend to our admiration. It has been well remarked, by an eloquent and interesting writer, that antichristian writers, while they are giving us their opinions, may in truth be giving us more, may be discovering their morals while they mean to teach us only their creed; and thus may carry, like Bellerophon, their own condemnation, while they imagine they are graciously conveying intelligence and new light to mankind. So that the old proverb, "Bellerophontis Literæ," may be a proper motto for the learned labours of them all.—Young's *Centaur*, p. 29.

[21] Diderot, indeed, in his execrable *Systême de la Nature*, has completed the view of this subject, that had been so imperfectly sketched by Bolingbroke and Hume. He has manfully undertaken to prove, not only that polytheism must have been, in the early ages of the world, the necessary result of men's observation of nature; but that it must be much more so "now that the course and progress of philosophy has tended to remove men's prejudices!" This completely relieves Hume's argument from all its perplexities.

[22] Dr Nares, in his admirable collection of sermons, preached at the *Bampton Lecture*, in 1805, pronounces, of this extraordinary production, that, if he wished to satisfy any person of the indispensable necessity of a divine Revelation in the first ages of the world, upon the infidel's own view of things, he would refer him at once to Mr Hume's *Natural History of Religion*. (Nares's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 485.) And Dr Maclaine says of the same work, in his *Letters to Mr Soame Jenyns*, that perhaps no book is more adapted to shew the unspeakable advantages of a divine Revelation.

[23] This work has been here, agreeably to the hitherto commonly received opinion, ascribed to Bishop Hurd. But, from the letters of Bishop Warburton lately published, it now appears, that it was the production of his own pen, and received only some additional colouring from his literary friend. See a curious account of this transaction in the *Letters of a late eminent Prelate*, pp. 239, 240.

try; the pettifogger, who fattens on the spoils of the fatherless and widow; the oppressor, who, to pamper his beastly appetite, abandons the deserving peasant to beggary and despair; the hypocrite; the debauchee; the gamester; the blasphemer, — prick up their ears when they are told, that a celebrated author has written a book full of such comfortable doctrines as the following: — That justice is not a natural but an artificial virtue, depending wholly on the arbitrary institutions of men, and previous to the establishment of civil society not at all incumbent: that moral, intellectual, and corporeal virtue, are all of the same kind; in other words, that to want honesty, to want understanding, and to want a leg, are equally the objects of moral disapprobation, and that it is no more a man's duty to be grateful or pious, than to have the genius of Homer, or the strength and beauty of Achilles: that every human action is necessary, and could not have been different from what it is: that when we speak of power as an attribute of any being, God himself not excepted, we use words without meaning: that we can form no idea of power, nor of any being endued with any power, much less of one endued with infinite power; and that we can never have reason to believe that any object, or quality of an object, exists, of which we cannot form an idea: that it is unreasonable to believe God to be infinitely wise and good, while there is any evil or disorder in the universe; and that we have no good reason to think that the universe proceeds from a cause: that the external material world does not exist; and that if the external world be once called in doubt as to its existence, we shall be at a loss to find arguments by which we may prove the being of God, or any of his attributes: that those who believe any thing certainly are fools: that adultery must be practised, if men would obtain all the advantages of life; that if generally practised, it would soon cease to be scandalous; and that, if practised secretly and frequently, it would by degrees come to be thought no crime at all:[24] that the question concerning the substance of the soul is unintelligible: that matter and motion may often be regarded as the cause of thought: that the soul of man becomes every different moment a different being; so that the actions I performed last year, or yesterday, or this morning, whether virtuous or vicious, are no more imputable to me, than the virtues of Aristides are imputable to Nero, or the crimes of Nero to the man of Ross." — *Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth*, by Dr Beattie, pp. 111 — 113. See also pp. 315, 316, where many other doctrines equally rational and valuable are to be found, together with the references to those parts of Mr Hume's works in which they are contained.

But this is not all. Mr Hume had not done enough, it seems, for the extinction of religion, and the subversion of morals; but, with a zeal bespeaking his fidelity to the master whom he served, he left behind him blasphemies to be published after his death, which even he was afraid to publish whilst he lived. So, indeed, his great admirer tells us, in his *Apology for the Life and Writings of David Hume:* whose posthumous papers, he says, would probably "carry his philosophy still nearer to *that point*, which he might not think it *discreet* to push too vigorously in his lifetime." What *that point* was, is but too evident on a single glance at the works which he thus bequeathed for the public benefit. The *Dialogues on Natural Religion*, and the *Essay on Suicide*, are standing monuments of a heart as wicked, and a head as weak, as ever belonged to any man who pretended to the character of a philosopher and a moralist. To leave deliberately, as a legacy to mankind, a recommendation of *self-murder*, and an assurance that there is *no God*, at the very moment when he was himself about to appear before the bar of that dread Being; and, whilst thus occupied for the destruction of his fellow-creatures, to amuse himself with pleasant conceits about Charon and his *ferry-boat*, (as his biographer informs us he did, when he was almost dropping into his grave,) has something in it so frightful, that one naturally recoils from the thought of it with horror. It seems to be equalled only by the hideous impiety of Diderot, who adduces it as a decisive proof of the non-existence of a God, that he was permitted to write a work filled with blasphemies against his nature, and arguments against his being.[25]

---

[24] "My inquiry concerning the *Principles of Morals* is, of all my writings, historical, philosophical, or literary, incomparably the *best*." Hume's *Life*, p. vii. The passage, referred to above, affords an excellent specimen of the writer's qualifications as a moral instructor. And yet it is of such a man as this, that such a man as Adam Smith has delivered the following testimony: — "I have always considered Mr Hume, both in his lifetime and since his death, as approaching as nearly to the idea of a *perfectly wise and virtuous man*, as perhaps the nature of human frailty will permit."—*Letter from Adam Smith, LL.D. to W. Strahan, Esq.* annexed to Hume's *Life*, and prefixed to the late edition of Hume's *History of England*. For the reception which such a declaration as this so amply merited, I refer the reader to Bishop Horne's *Letter to Dr Adam Smith:* in which, as well as in the *Letters on Infidelity* at large, he will find the ablest and most incontestable confutation of Hume and his infidel associates.

In truth, the extract from Hume on the subject of adultery appeared to me so monstrous, that, with some doubts of Dr Beattie's accuracy, I turned to the original to ascertain its fairness, and there found the following justification of the reporter: — "It is needless to dissemble. The consequence of a very free commerce between the sexes, and of their living much together, will often terminate in intrigues and gallantry. We must sacrifice somewhat of the useful, if we be very anxious to obtain all the agreeable qualities; and cannot pretend to reap alike every advantage. Instances of licence daily multiplying, will weaken the scandal with the one sex, and teach the other by degrees to adopt the famous maxim of La Fontaine, with regard to female infidelity; 'that if one knows it, it is but a small matter; if one knows it not, it is nothing.'" (Hume's *Essays*, vol. ii. p. 394.) Again (p. 255) he contends, that the necessary "combination of the parents for the subsistence of their young is that alone which requires the virtue of chastity or fidelity to the married bed. Without such a utility, it will readily be owned (he asserts) that such a virtue would never be thought of." And this being a favourite subject with this writer, whose Inquiry concerning the *Principles of Morals*, is boasted of by himself as his best work, he proceeds to enlarge upon it in an additional note, (p. 490,) in which he calls in the aid of Greek to sustain him in his philosophic profligacy, and, referring all notions of virtue and vice to public utility, asks, with an air of final triumph,—"And, indeed, to what other purpose than that of utility do all the ideas of chastity and modesty serve?"—This is the *perfectly wise and virtuous man* of Adam Smith.

Dr Aikin's remarks (in the *General Biography*) on this extraordinary language of Dr Smith, although not pressing upon the parts of Hume's writings here adverted to, deserve to be noticed. "We may," he says, "reasonably demur to Dr Smith's moral estimate, in attributing the perfection of virtue to a man, whose leading principle was, by his own confession, selfish, (the acquisition of literary fame,) and who never seems to have made any of those sacrifices of interest and inclination to public good, in which virtuous action chiefly consists. Farther, whatever degree of freedom of discussion may be justifiable, with the benefit of mankind in view, it may be doubted whether a mere fondness for speculation, or a love of philosophic applause, will morally excuse a writer, for sporting with opinions which are commonly held of the highest importance to human welfare."

Having, however, made mention of this valuable bequest of Mr Hume, I cannot deny the reader the satisfaction of knowing somewhat of the precious materials of which it consists. And first, as to his *Dialogues*. He there exhibits various modes, in which the world may have been produced; all of which he pronounces to be to the full as satisfactory, as that of a creation by the will of the Deity. *Generation* or *vegetation*, he says, will answer the purpose; and the latter process, which he prefers, he thus particularly explains:—"In like manner as a tree sheds its seed into the neighbouring fields, and produces other trees, so the great vegetable, the world, or this planetary system, produces within itself certain seeds, which, being scattered into the surrounding chaos, vegetate into new worlds. A comet, for instance, is the seed of a world: and after it has been fully ripened, by passing from sun to sun, and star to star, it is at last tossed into the unformed elements which every where surround this universe, and immediately sprouts up into a new system." (*Dialogues*, p. 132.) But, as this process of vegetable production supposes a mother vegetable already in existence, or a world already in being, so accurate a reasoner could not but account for the formation of the first world, from which all others are to sprout. And this he does in two ways, that he may the better satisfy all descriptions of readers. Either such a process has been going on from eternity; or a world might have been formed originally thus:—"A finite number of particles is only susceptible of finite transpositions; and it must happen in an eternal duration, that every possible position must be tried. The continual motion of matter, therefore, in less than infinite transpositions, must produce order; and order, when once established, supports itself." (*Dialogues*, pp. 146, 149.)—Now must not Ephraim Jenkinson, and his cosmogonies, hide their diminished heads, on a comparison with this philosopher and his sublime inventions? How far inferior also was the object of the former sage to that proposed by the latter! The one but sought to cheat the honest Vicar of Wakefield of his horse, but the other looks to the more glorious attainment, of cheating mankind of their trust in a God, and their hopes of a futurity. How meagre and unphilosophical is the first chapter of Genesis, compared with such lofty speculations as these of Mr Hume!

If we turn, now, to that other valuable performance, the *Essay on Suicide*,[26] there we find truths no less momentous, and reasonings no less acute, than those which the former had exhibited. He informs us, that the whole scope of man's creation is limited to the present life; that the life of a man is of no greater importance than that of an oyster; and as it is admitted that there is no crime in diverting the Nile or the Danube from their courses, so he contends there can be none, in turning a few ounces of blood from their natural channel; and so, upon the whole, he peremptorily concludes in favour of self-murder! He goes farther; and, to satisfy the conscience of the Theist, he maintains, that, on the supposition of a God, we are acting under the direction of Providence, when we put an end to our existence; and, again, to satisfy the conscience of the Christian, he endeavours to evince the lawfulness of suicide under the Christian dispensation. The last point, indeed, it has been remarked, it is not difficult to make out, provided the liberty of putting two texts together be permitted:—thus, "Judas departed, and went and hanged himself"—"Go and do thou likewise." Mr Hume's arguments are little better.

So much for this paragon of modern metaphysicians; this deep thinker and acute reasoner, whom it was at one time so much the fashion with witlings and libertines to extol. As to certain advantages of style, Mr Hume, no doubt, possessed them; but as to his *rea-*

---

[25] "Si ce Dieu tout puissant est jaloux de ses prerogatives,—comment permet-il, qu'un mortel comme moi ose attaquer ses droits, ses titres, son existence même?" vol. ii. p. 60, of *Systeme de la Nature;* a work which was published under the name of Mirabaud, but is supposed with good reason to have had the atrocious Diderot for its author.

[26] Some of Mr Hume's admirers became so much ashamed of this monstrous and absurd performance, that they were led to deny that it ever came from his pen. Whoever wishes for a complete proof of his being the author, may consult the *Monthly Review* for 1784, vol. lxx. p. 427.

soning, nothing under that name can be more contemptible. This, indeed, seems now pretty generally admitted; and few, who have any regard for the opinion of men of sense, would, at this day, venture to support the paradoxes, and adduce the arguments, of David Hume. By the species of reasoning adopted by that writer, Dr Beattie has well remarked, it would be easy to prove any doctrine; and to evince this, he supplies the following *recipe*, as conveying the whole mystery of the manufacture of his metaphysical paradoxes.—"Take a word (an abstract term is the most convenient) which admits of more than one signification; and, by the help of a predicate or copula, form a proposition suitable to your system, or to your humour, or to any other thing you please, except truth. When laying down your premises, you are to use the name of the quality or subject, in one sense; and, when inferring your conclusion, in another. You are then to urge a few equivocal facts very slightly examined (the more slightly the better) as a farther proof of the said conclusion; and to shut up all with citing some ancient authorities, either real or fictitious, as may best suit your purpose. A few occasional strictures on religion as an unphilosophical thing, and a sneer at the *Whole Duty of Man*, or any other good book, will give your dissertation what many are pleased to call a *liberal turn;* and will go near to convince the world, that you are a candid philosopher, a manly free-thinker, and a very fine writer." (*Essay on Truth*, p. 309.) This gives by no means an exaggerated idea of Mr Hume's mode of conducting his metaphysical disquisitions; so that what has been said of his *Dialogues*, may be applied, with truth, to almost all his reasonings on moral or religious subjects,—namely, that they cannot possibly hurt any man of a philosophical turn, or even any man of common sense; that they may serve, indeed, to confirm the giddy, the profligate, and the unprincipled, in their prejudices against religion and virtue, but must be despised by every man who has the smallest grain of seriousness or reflection.

Gray's estimate of his character I cannot prevail upon myself to suppress, not only because it comes from a man of real genius, learning, and reflection, but because it must be admitted to be altogether untinctured with the supposed prejudices of a divine:—"I have always thought David Hume a pernicious writer, and believe he has done as much mischief here as in his own country. 'A turbid and shallow stream often appears to our apprehensions very deep.' A professed sceptic can be guided by nothing but his present passions (if he has any) and his interests; and to be masters of his philosophy we need not his book or advice, for every child is capable of the same thing, without any study at all. Is not that *naïveté* and good humour, which his admirers celebrate in him, owing to this, that he has continued all his days an infant, but one that unhappily has been taught to read and write? That childish nation, the French, have given him vogue and fashion, and we, as usual, have learned from them to admire him at second hand." (Mason's *Gray*,[27] vol. ii. pp. 249, 250.)

There are two striking features in the character of Hume, which have not been adverted to in the sketch here drawn of him by Gray—his *disingenuousness*, and his *bigotry*.

To couple the term *bigot*[28] with the name of David Hume, may, at first sight, appear to partake of his own paradox. But it should be considered, that bigotry is not necessarily connected with religious belief; and that it is no less possible to display its invincible prejudices, by an irrational and intolerant zeal against, than for, religion. Now, undoubtedly, in this sense, no man has proved himself more of a bigot than Hume. Far from being the calm and philosophic inquirer which he pretends to be, he is evidently influenced by an insatiable zeal for the propagation of his atheistical tenets; and his intolerant and persecuting spirit against those who oppose the adoption of his infidel creed is every where manifested by his furious abuse of all who are tenacious of their Christian hopes, but more particularly of the clergy, and these, too, of every religious persuasion, without distinction. Of this, abundant proofs are to be met with in almost every part of his writ-

[27] For some admirable and beautiful remarks by the same author, on the Materialists, and upon Lord Shaftesbury, and particularly on Lord Bolingbroke and his *Philosophical Works*, see the same volume, pp. 118—125. With respect to Hume, we are informed by Mr Ritchie, that he was particularly stung by the severe animadversions of Gray. For, as the biographer adds, "notwithstanding the eulogium which he sometimes bestows on the equanimity of his own temper, it is known, that he felt the attacks on his literary reputation with exquisite sensibility: and although he persevered in the resolution of writing no answers to his antagonists, (except in the single case of his quarrel with Rousseau,) he did not always receive the criticisms of others with the apathy he professes." *Account of the Life and Writings of David Hume*, p. 301. Indeed, if we give credit to the account of him in the *London Review* for 1777, we shall pronounce him one of the most choleric, instead of being one of the calmest, of philosophers. His *Treatise of Human Nature* having experienced considerable severity of criticism in a publication entitled, *The Works of the Learned*, the author (as the *Review* states) became so highly provoked, that "he flew into a violent rage to demand satisfaction of Jacob Robinson the publisher; whom he kept, during the paroxysm of his anger, at his sword's point, trembling lest a period should be put to the life of a sober critic by a raving philosopher." It is well known, also, that his resentment against Dr Beattie was so violent, that he could hardly put upon it any decent restraint.

[28] I find indeed, from an anecdote in Ritchie's *Life of Hume*, that I have his own authority for this epithet. For, as his biographer informs us, his reply to a friend, who jocularly threatened him with writing an account of his life and character, was, that as to his character, he would himself give it in a single sentence; "candid and liberal with respect to the prejudices of others, bigoted with respect to his own."

ings; but more especially in his Twenty-first Essay, on *National Characters*, (*Essays*, vol. i. p. 215,) where, and in the annexed note T, he pronounces "priests of all religions to be the same," and goes on laboriously to prove, that a priest, as such, "must be destitute of every virtue, and possessed by almost every vice." How strongly Horace Walpole—whom I particularly name, as not having any undue leaning towards Revelation, and as being, it must be supposed, tolerably free from that *odium theologicum*, which our author so plentifully charges against the clergy—how strongly, I say, he condemns this intolerant zeal in this man of pretended moderation and philosophic calmness, may be seen on looking into his works.[29] Now, surely, this is a most unreasonable intrusion into what our author so willingly admits to be the exclusive province of the clergy. There is some excuse for warmth, in the man who perceives an attempt to rob him of what he holds most precious; but there is none for the man, who makes that attempt, flying into a passion, because it is resisted.

Again, as to the *disingenuousness* of Hume; this is sufficiently manifest on the inspection of his works. The instances adduced by the various writers who have taken the trouble to expose his flimsy sophisms are so multiplied, as to render it unnecessary to dwell upon this subject. Of these writers, in addition to the authors of the well-known answers to his *Essay on Miracles*, (an essay which, but for adventitious circumstances, could not have deserved an answer,) I would particularly recommend to the young reader, Dr Beattie, and Bishops Hurd and Horne, who have, in the works already alluded to in this Postscript, exhibited this imposing and deceitful infidel in his true colours. Nor is it only in matter of *reasoning*, but in matter of *fact*, that he stands convicted of dishonesty. No writer, perhaps, has established this more clearly than Dr Elrington, in his *Donnellan Lecture Sermons*, to which I refer particularly at pages 233, 234, and 296—302.

It is but fair, however, to confess, that Mr Hume has not confined altogether to religious subjects his talent of disingenuous representation. His unfaithfulness and gross partiality as a historian, have been long pretty generally acknowledged: and it has been pronounced by judicious and candid writers upon the subject of English history, that the *History* which Mr Hume has given to the world is a most injurious work to put into the hands of the British youth, in order to give them just ideas of the history or constitution of England. Dr Towers, in his *Observations on Mr Hume's History*, says, that "fidelity, accuracy, and impartiality, are requisite in a historian; and that in these Mr Hume is greatly deficient." Dr Gilbert Stuart also points out, in his *View of Society in Europe*, (see particularly pp. 320, 323, 326,) many gross and wilful errors in the historian: and at p. 327, he fully demonstrates how unfit Mr Hume was for the task which he undertook. "Mr Hume," he says, "struck with the talents of Dr Brady, deceived by his ability, disposed to pay adulation to government, or willing to profit by a system formed with art, and ready for adoption, has executed his *History* upon the tenets of this writer. Yet, of Dr Brady it ought to be remembered, that he was the slave of a faction, and that he meanly prostituted an excellent understanding, to vindicate tyranny, and to destroy the rights of his nation. With no less pertinacity, but with an air of greater candour, Mr Hume has employed himself to the same purposes; and his *History*, from its beginning to its conclusion, is chiefly to be regarded as a plausible pretext of prerogative. No friend to humanity, and to the freedom of this kingdom, will consider his constitutional inquiries, with their effect upon his narrative, and compare them with the ancient and venerable monuments of our story, without feeling a lively surprise, and a patriot indignation." Mr Fox, also, in his late celebrated work, speaks of the continual display, in Hume's *History*, of his "partiality to kings and princes, as intolerable. Nay," he adds, "it is, in my opinion, quite ridiculous: and is more like the foolish admiration which women and children sometimes have for kings, than the opinion, right or wrong, of a philosopher." And a set of writers, whose national partialities would not indispose them to Hume, agree fully in this sentiment. "Few things," they say, "seem more unaccountable, and, indeed, absurd, than that Hume should have taken part with high church and high monarchy men. The persecutions which he suffered in his youth from the Presbyterians may, perhaps, have influenced his ecclesiastical partialities. But that he should have sided with the Tudors and the Stuarts against the people, seems quite inconsistent with all the *great traits of his character*." (*Edinb. Review*, vol. xii. p. 276.) What great traits of character?

---

[29] Lord Orford, indeed, omits no opportunity of expressing his dislike and even contempt of the common run of what are called Geniuses, and Philosophers, in modern times. "No Genius I have known," says he, "has had common sense enough to balance the impertinence of their pretensions. They hate priests, but love dearly to have an altar at their feet; for which reason it is much pleasanter to read them than to know them." (Lord Orford's *Works*, vol. v. p. 421.) This observation, though immediately directed against Rousseau, who was at this time introduced into England by Hume, was manifestly not designed exclusively for him. And although Hume is frequently spoken of in terms apparently favourable, yet even in his lordship's letters to Hume himself, (vol. iv. pp. 260—265,) the cutting sarcasms and contemptuous sneers against authors and philosophers of a certain class, sufficiently intimate in what light the noble author really viewed the Scottish as well as the French philosopher.

We have already seen what *they* amount to. No, no; the man who is not influenced by a love of truth must be destitute of principle. And in such a character, inconsistencies must abound. Where there is no standard to refer to, no anchor to hold fast, what can be expected but perpetual vacillation? The man who laboured to traduce Scripture would not fail to falsify history. He who could be blind to the grandeur and glory of the Christian dispensation, could not easily discover the beauty and sublimity of the British constitution. And we need not be surprised to find the same man a renegade in religion, and a slave in politics.

The mischievous and dishonest uses, also, to which Hume perverts his History, should not pass without observation. Mere historic falsehood had lost much of its interest in the breast of this writer, had it not been made subservient to his favourite object, the subversion of moral and religious truth. The picture, which has been already drawn of the historian in this light, is sketched with such justness and good taste by the masterly pencil of Mrs H. More, that I cannot do better than present it to the reader's view as it has come from the hand of that admirable woman.

"There is a sedateness in his manner, which imposes; a sly gravity in his scepticism, which puts the reader more off his guard, than the vehemence of censure, or the levity of wit; for we are always less disposed to suspect a man who is too wise to appear angry. That same wisdom makes him too correct to invent calumnies, but it does not preserve him from doing what is scarcely less disingenuous. He implicitly adopts the injurious relations of those annalists who were most hostile to the reformed faith;[30] though he must have known their accounts to be aggravated and discoloured, if not absolutely invented. He thus makes others responsible

---

[30] Villers, in his *Essay on the Reformation*, (Mill's translation, p. 107,) offers the following observations, which go to support the above allegation, and deserve to be particularly attended to:—"It is well known with what fury the rage of party pours out calumny upon eminent men. Upon Luther, above all men, it has been discharged in torrents. Among other causes, it has been found out, that his zeal arose only from the discontent of the Augustines, who beheld, it is said, with envy the Dominicans invested by the Pope with the commission of preaching indulgences. That Maimbourg should have picked up such a story is nothing wonderful; but it is inconceivable, that Voltaire and Hume should have repeated it as a certain fact." This author then proceeds to expose the falsehood of the calumny, and refers to a note of Dr Maclaine on Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, in which, he says, is "proved, beyond dispute, the absurdity of the imputation." The translator, pursuing the same subject, goes on thus:—"The credit of Voltaire is now so low in this country, that no means, however base, of forwarding a favourite object will be thought beneath him. He is now detected, and his authority is of very little value. But Hume, who, through the whole course of his History, lies in wait for an opportunity of throwing discredit upon the cause both of religion and of liberty, who possessed a rooted enmity against all the best interests of mankind, and whose actions exhibit more of deliberate misanthropy than those of any other man perhaps that ever lived, still enjoys a reputation and authority which he by no means deserves; and his writings contribute strongly to corrupt the public sentiments. Dr Maclaine's note, referred to by Villers, is a full exposure, more full perhaps than was necessary, of one of those instances of bad faith with which his History abounds. If any one were to publish an edition of his History, with notes, pointing out the eagerness with which he has used not only lawful, but poisoned arms against religion and liberty, exposing the unfounded assertions, the weak reflections, and the barbarous phraseology which he so often employs, he would abate that false admiration so long attached to his works, and confer a great obligation upon the public." These charges against Hume may possibly not be sufficiently temperate and measured, but they contain in them much of truth; and the principal charge, that of historical bad faith, is undoubtedly made out by Dr Maclaine in the note alluded to; which note I here subjoin, not merely because it establishes the point at present under consideration, but because it so completely rescues the author of the Reformation from the unfounded calumnies which Hume had contributed to circulate, and which of late days an interested zeal has propagated in this country with more than usual industry.

"Mr Hume, in his history of the reign of Henry the Eighth, has thought proper to repeat what the enemies of the Reformation, and some of its dubious or ill-informed friends, have advanced with respect to the motives that engaged Luther to oppose the doctrine of indulgences. This elegant and persuasive historian tells us, that the 'Austin friars had usually been employed in Saxony to preach indulgences, and from this trust had derived both profit and consideration; that Arcemboldi gave this occupation to the Dominicans; that Martin Luther, an Austin friar, professor in the University of Wirtemberg, resenting the affront put upon his own order, began to preach against the abuses that were committed in the sale of indulgences, and, being provoked by opposition, proceeded even to decry indulgences themselves.' It were to be wished that Mr Hume's candour had engaged him to examine this accusation better before he had ventured to repeat it. For, in the first place, it is not true that the Austin friars had been usually employed in Saxony to preach indulgences. It is well known that the commission had been offered alternately, and sometimes jointly, to all the mendicants, whether Austin friars, Dominicans, Franciscans, or Carmelites. Nay, from the year 1229, that lucrative commission was principally intrusted with the Dominicans; and in the records which relate to indulgences, we rarely meet with the name of an Austin friar, and not one single act by which it appears that the Roman Pontiff ever named the friars of that order to the office under consideration. More particularly, it is remarkable, that, for half a century before Luther, (*i. e.* from 1450 to 1517,) during which period indulgences were sold with the most scandalous marks of avaricious extortion and impudence, we scarcely meet with the name of an Austin friar employed in that service, if we except a monk, named Palzius, who was no more than an underling of the papal questor Raymond Peraldus; so far is it from being true, that the Augustine Order were exclusively, or even usually, employed in that service. Mr Hume has built his assertion upon the sole authority of a single expression of Paul Sarpi, which has been abundantly refuted by De Priero, Pallavicini, and Graveson, the mortal enemies of Luther.

"But it may be alleged, that, even supposing it was not usual to employ the Augustine friars alone in the propagation of indulgences, yet Luther might be offended at seeing such an important commission given to the Dominicans exclusively, and that, consequently, this was his motive in opposing the propagation of indulgences. To shew the injustice of this allegation, I observe, secondly, that, in the time of Luther, the preaching of indulgences was become such an odious and unpopular matter, that it is far from being probable, that Luther would have been solicitous about obtaining such a commission either for himself or for his order. The princes of Europe, with many bishops and multitudes of learned and pious men, had opened their eyes upon the turpitude of this infamous traffic; and even the Franciscans and Dominicans, towards the conclusion of the fifteenth century, opposed it publicly, both in their discourses and in their writings. Nay, more, the very commission, which is supposed to have excited the envy of Luther, was offered by Leo to the General of the Franciscans, and was refused both by him and his order, for the worst things he asserts, and spreads the mischief without avowing the malignity. When he speaks from himself, the sneer is so cool, the irony so sober, the contempt so discreet, the moderation so insidious, the difference between Popish bigotry and Protestant firmness, between the fury of the persecutor and the resolution of the martyr, so little marked; the distinctions between intolerant frenzy and heroic zeal so melted into each other, that though he contrives to make the reader feel some indignation at the tyrant, he never leads him to feel any reverence for the sufferer. He ascribes such a slender superiority to one religious system above another, that the young reader, who does not come to the perusal with his principles formed, will be in danger of thinking that the reformation was really not worth contending for. But in nothing is the skill of this accomplished sophist more apparent, than in the artful way in which he piques his readers into a conformity with his own views concerning religion. Human pride, he knew, naturally likes to range itself on the side of ability. He therefore skilfully works on this passion, by treating with a sort of contemptuous superiority, as weak and credulous men, all whom he represents as being under the religious delusion. To the shameful practice of confounding fanaticism with real religion, he adds the disingenuous habit of accounting for the best actions of the best men, by referring them to some low motive; and affects to confound the designs of the religious and the corrupt, so artfully, as if no radical difference existed between them." (Mrs H. More's *Hints for a Young Princess*, vol i. pp. 156—158.) Thus does this elegant writer describe the pernicious tendencies of Hume's History, which, as possessing at the same time many of the beauties of style, she happily characterizes in a word, as "a serpent under a bed of roses," (p. 155.) And thus we see, that in no occupation of Mr Hume, whether exercising himself as the light essayist, the deep philosopher, or the grave historian, does he ever lose sight of the one great warfare, in which he had enlisted himself against truth, virtue, and religion.

In this Postscript to the foregoing Number, I have wandered far, indeed, from my subject; but by no means from my object: for, if I shall have the good fortune of impressing any one of my youthful readers with a just opinion and abhorrence of such writers as Bolingbroke and Hume, I conceive I shall have done no small service to the cause of truth, of virtue, and of religion.

No. LXX.—Page 22. Col. 1.

ON THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE ANNUAL EXPIATION UNDER THE LAW, AND THE ONE GREAT EXPIATION UNDER THE GOSPEL.

The sacrifice on the anniversary of expiation seems to be distinguished from all others by a

---

who gave it over entirely to Albert, Bishop of Mentz and Magdeburg. Is it then to be imagined that either Luther, or the other Austin friars, aspired after a commission of which the Franciscans were ashamed? Besides, it is a mistake to affirm that this office was given to the Dominicans in general, since it was given to Tetzel alone, an individual member of that order, who had been notorious for his profligacy, barbarity, and extortion.

"But that neither resentment nor envy were the motives that led Luther to oppose the doctrine and publication of indulgences, will appear with the utmost evidence, if we consider, in the third place, — That he was never accused of any such motives, either in the edicts of the pontiffs of his time, or amidst the other reproaches of the contemporary writers, who defended the cause of Rome, and who were far from being sparing of their invectives and calumnies. All the contemporary advisers of Luther are absolutely silent on this head. From the year 1517 to 1546, when the dispute about indulgences was carried on with the greatest warmth and animosity, not one writer ever ventured to reproach Luther with these ignoble motives of opposition now under consideration. I speak not of Erasmus, Sleiden, De Thou, Guicciardini, and others, whose testimony might perhaps be suspected of partiality in his favour: but I speak of Cajetan, Hogstrat, De Prierio, Emser, and even the infamous John Tetzel, whom Luther opposed with such vehemence and bitterness. Even Cochlæus was silent on this head during the life of Luther; though after the death of that great reformer, he broached the calumny I am here refuting. But such was the scandalous character of this man, who was notorious for fraud, calumny, lying, and their sister vices, that Pallavicini, Bossuet, and other enemies of Luther, were ashamed to make use either of his name or testimony. Now, may it not be fairly presumed, that the contemporaries of Luther were better judges of his character and the principles from which he acted, than those who lived in after-times? Can it be imagined, that motives to action, which escaped the prying eyes of Luther's contemporaries, should have discovered themselves to us who live at such a distance of time from the scene of action, to M. Bossuet, to Mr Hume, and to other abettors of this ill-contrived and foolish story! Either there are no rules of moral evidence, or Mr Hume's assertion is entirely groundless."—Mosheim's *Eccl. Hist.* cent. xvi. sect. i. chap. 2, vol. ii. pp. 17, 18.

Dr Maclaine has very properly observed, that the cause of the Reformation (which must stand by its own intrinsic dignity, and is in no way affected by the views or characters of its instruments) can derive no strength from this inquiry, but as it may tend to vindicate the personal character of a man, who has done eminent service to the cause of religion. In truth, so far from looking for selfish and ignoble motives to account for Luther's zealous opposition to the publication of indulgences by Tetzel, one has only to read the account given by Mosheim of this transaction, to have his astonishment excited, that Luthers did not start up in thousands to raise their voices against it. "This bold and enterprising monk," he says, speaking of Tetzel, "had been chosen, on account of his uncommon impudence, to preach and proclaim in Germany those famous indulgences of Leo X., which administered remission of all sins, past, present, and to come, however enormous their nature, to those who were rich enough to purchase them. The frontless monk executed this iniquitous commission, not only with matchless insolence, indecency, and fraud, but even carried his impiety so far as to derogate from the all-sufficient power and influence of the merits of Christ." The translator adds, in exemplification, that, "in describing the efficacy of these indulgences, Tetzel said, among other enormities, 'that even had any one ravished the mother of God, he (Tetzel) had wherewithal to efface his guilt.' He also boasted, that he 'had saved more souls from hell by these indulgences, than St Peter had converted to Christianity by his preaching.'" Yet Hume could discover no cause for Luther's resistance of such indulgences, but that he had lost the sale of them himself.

peculiar degree of solemnity, as if to mark its more immediate reference to the great sacrifice of Christ. Thus, on this day, we find the high priest exclusively commanded to officiate: and on this day alone, in the stated exercises of his office, was he permitted to enter into the holy of holies, and to carry the blood of the victim into the presence of God, to offer it before that glory, which, seated between the two cherubims, overshadowed the mercy-seat, and represented the Divinity,—a circumstance which the apostle particularly marks, (Heb. ix.) as prefiguring the entrance of our great High Priest, with the blood offered by him for our redemption, into the true presence of the most High, the immediate habitation of God's holiness and glory. The high priest also seems to have been selected for the solemn services of this day, as more adequately representing the *whole* assembly, in whose name he sacrificed and supplicated forgiveness; and, therefore, more properly typifying him, who, representing the whole human race, was to procure redemption by his blood for the whole assembly of mankind.

Whoever wishes for a more minute detail of the particulars of this solemn sacrifice, and of its peculiar fitness to represent the sacrifice of Christ, may consult Outram. *De Sacr.* lib. 1, cap. xviii. § 6, 7; lib. 11, cap. iii. § 2, 3, 4. He will also receive much satisfaction from an examination of Ainsworth's comment on the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus. For many valuable remarks connected with the subject of this Number, Daubeny's *Discourses on the Connection between the Old and New Test.* may be consulted. And in Rhenferdius's treatise *De Comparatione Expiationis Anniv. Pontificis Max. V. et N. Test.* (Meuschen's *Nov. Test.* &c. pp. 1013—1039,) a most copious and circumstantial enumeration is given of the particulars, in which the annual expiation by the Jewish high priest resembled the one great expiation of the New Testament. It may be proper to observe, that such is the force of the resemblance, that Socinus himself admits this anniversary sacrifice of atonement,—inasmuch as "it was of special divine ordinance, at a stated season, offered by the high priest, and appointed to atone for *all* the sins of *all* the people,"—to be fairly accounted typical of the sacrifice of Christ.—Socin. *Oper.* (*Prælect. Theol.* cap. xxii.) tom. i. p. 583.

No. LXXI.—Page 22. Col. 1.

ON THE NATURE AND IMPORT OF THE CEREMONY OF THE SCAPE-GOAT.

On this, see what has been said in pp. 97, 98, and attend particularly to the fifth, seventh, and tenth verses of the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus, from which it appears that the *two goats* are, throughout the chapter, spoken of as *one* sin-offering; being expressly so *called* in the first of these verses; presented *jointly* as the offering of the people in the second; and, though separated into two distinct *parts* by the lot cast, in the ninth verse, yet *each* described as contributing to the *atonement* for the people, as appears from the tenth verse compared with the seventeenth. Indeed, that the *two goats* made but *one* sin-offering on this occasion, the best commentators freely admit. See Jameson's observations on this chapter of Leviticus. The reason of this seems obvious. The death of the animal was requisite to represent the *means* by which the expiation was effected: and the bearing away the sins of the people on the head of the animal, was requisite to exhibit the *effect;* namely, the removal of the guilt. But for these distinct objects, two animals were necessary to complete the sin-offering.

It must be allowed, that an account somewhat different has been given of this matter by some very judicious commentators. The goat sent into the wilderness, and that which was offered up in expiation, jointly, they say, typify the great Redeemer of mankind: the former animal exhibiting that which could not be displayed by the latter, as having been slain, namely, that Christ was not only to be "delivered for our offences," but to be "raised again for our justification, (Rom. iv. 25;) and that although he was to be "crucified through weakness," yet he was to "live by the power of God," (2 Cor. xiii. 4.) Thus Ainsworth, Bochart, Alting, and, before them, Augustine and Procopius, understand it. The opinion of these writers, respecting the truth to be illustrated by the dismissal of the second goat, may perhaps not improperly be combined with that which has been here proposed: so that whilst the goat which was slain exemplifies the sacrifice offered for the sins of mankind; that which was sent away alive, may represent not only the removal of those sins in consequence of that sacrifice, but also the restoration to life of him by whom they were so removed. Whether, however, this point be admitted or not, the circumstance of the two goats jointly constituting one offering, by exhibiting the different adjuncts, cannot, I think, with any reason be controverted.

Rhenferd contends that this point is completely established by an evidence resulting from the nature of the ceremony itself. For, he says, the imposition of hands, and the confession and implied translation of sins upon the victim, being usual in the sacrifice of animals in expiation; and this ceremony being omitted in the case of the goat that was slain, whilst it was employed in the case of the goat that was sent away; decidedly prove, that both animals were designed to be considered as one offering, and that the latter, consequently, represented him who was to bear the sins of Israel, and by his sufferings to expiate and to remove them. See Jac. Rhenferd. *Exp. Anniv.* &c. p. 1033 of Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talm.*

Whoever may have a curiosity to know whether any, and what ceremony, analogous to that of the scape-goat, is observed by the Jews of modern times, on the day of expiation, may turn to p. 74, where he will find, that a *cock* is now substituted for the legal victims; and that the entrails of the animal to which the sins of the offerers are conceived to have been transferred by imprecation, are exposed upon the top of the house, to be carried away by the birds into their solitary haunts, in like manner as, under the law, the scape-goat had been conceived to carry away the sins of the people into the wilderness. See also Buxtorf. *Synag. Jud.* and Broughton's *Dictionary of Religions*, article *Expiation.*

No. LXXII.—Page 22. Col. 2.

SOCINIAN OBJECTIONS URGED BY A DIVINE OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH AGAINST THE DOCTRINE OF THE VICARIOUS IMPORT OF THE MOSAIC SACRIFICES, AND AGAINST OTHER DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The arguments in behalf of the vicarious import of the Mosaic sacrifices have been so fully examined in Nos. XXXVIII. and XXXIX., that nothing need here be added to what has been already offered upon this head.

It is with great regret that, in reverting to this subject, I feel myself obliged to notice the following observations, which have been recently hazarded by a divine of the Established Church, with a rashness and a flippancy which cannot too strongly be condemned.

"Those who seek a protection for their absurd and unscriptural ideas of a vicarious punishment, under the shelter of the Jewish ritual, do not consider that that ritual was solely intended to preserve the Jews from the idolatry and polytheism of the neighbouring nations, by keeping their imagination sensibly interested, their minds perpetually employed, and their time continually occupied with the performance of rites and ceremonies, sacrifices and oblations, which all tended to keep alive in their minds the unity of the Godhead; and thus to preserve them a distinct people, till the time appointed came for the opening of the Christian dispensation, when the distinction between Jew and Gentile was to be done away.[1] There are, I know, some people whose fancy is stronger than their judgment, who suppose that the varied sacrifices and ordinances of the Mosaic ritual, and indeed all the fractional parts of the Mosaic dispensation, were intended only as types and figures of particular facts and doctrines in the history and institution of the Messiah. Those, whose minds are not fitted for larger and grander views of the ways of God, may well employ their time in these puerile conceits; but they will be despised by wise and sober men, who do not like to assimilate the operations of the Deity to the trick and pantomime of a conjuror."—*The Guide to Immortality*, by Robert Fellowes, vol. iii. pp. 55, 56.

Such are the modest insinuations of a divine whose mind is, of course, "fitted for large and grand views of the ways of God;" whose comprehensive ken enables him, although unaided by any lights from Scripture, to discern what was the sole design of the Jewish ritual; who is possessed of "a judgment," that at once detects the silly fancies of all such as "suppose" that that ritual could bear any relation to the Messiah; and who is also "wise and sober" enough to "despise" all those, who, by forming such a supposition, "assimilate the operations of the Deity to the trick and pantomime of a conjuror."

---

[1] The same idea this author takes pains frequently to enforce. In his *Religion without Cant*, (p. 112,) he states it thus:—"The ceremonial laws of the Mosaic dispensation were intended merely to preserve unbroken the barrier between Jew and Gentile, till the coming of him," &c. And yet, will it be believed, that in the very same page, this determined enemy of every thing typical in the Mosaic dispensation, affirms, that, in the Mosaical law, the great scheme of redemption was obscurely insinuated, rather than distinctly portrayed, in types and figures, in the sacrifices of the altar, and the atonements of the priest? The Redeemer, he adds, "was seen through the rites of the Mosaic dispensation as through a veil or a glass, darkly." How then does this "wise and sober" writer differ from those, "whose fancy prevailing over their judgment," has led them to view the Mosaic dispensation as containing in it something typical of the Christian? He admits, that the sacrifices and atonements under the one, did obscurely typify the great scheme of redemption in the other. And who contends that the type was any other than a faint and obscure draught of the reality? Thus, then, he saves his reader the trouble of confuting the assertion, that the Jewish ritual was solely intended to form a barrier between Jew and Gentile, and that none but a visionary could ever have dreamt of its bearing a typical relation to the Christian scheme.

This is not the only case in which the freedom and variety of this author's views have led him to mutually confronting positions on the same subject. To select one instance more out of a rich abundance. In p. 179 of the last named work, he tells the Christian, that "it is only by personal acts of sin, hardening into habits of sin, that he becomes a transgressor, subject to the wrath of God;" and, agreeably to this, he asserts again, in p. 210, that "it is not by some occasional misdoings that we are to pass sentence on any man;"—that, "in estimating the worth of the human character, we are not to form our calculations on the conduct of one single day, but to take the average of many days and years, and see what proportion a man's violation of his duty bears to its performance, his virtues to his vices, his sins to his righteousness." And yet this indulgent moralist, who had thus far endeavoured to relieve us from any inconvenient pressure of sin upon our consciences, by enabling us to reduce the balance against us in the debtor and creditor account of transgression and righteousness, shortly after turns upon us, all at once, with this unpleasant sentence: "The moment we have violated any one duty of truth, justice, and humanity, or any one saying of the perfect law of Christ, that moment we are polluted with guilt, and, without repentance, obnoxious to punishment." See p. 220.—Really, it were by no means unadvisable, that a writer (not excepting even a teacher of theology) should take some little pains to know what his own opinions were, before he proposed them for the instruction of the public.

Now, who are the persons, who, by forming such strange suppositions, and by indulging in such "puerile conceits," have rendered themselves the objects of this gentleman's contempt? Not to speak of the person alluded to in the last note, (who probably stands too well with the author, to be exposed to any portion of that scorn which is to be shared among those who entertain such notions,) one of the first and most distinguished in this way is the Apostle Paul. He has gone the unreasonable length of endeavouring to prove, in a most minute and laboured detail, that the institutions of the Law were but shadows of things to come. But, then, of Saint Paul, and his various "puerile conceits," this writer makes no account. The apostle, he informs us, "labours with mysterious meanings, which he fails in developing with sufficient perspicuity."—"He was of the sect of the Pharisees, who were wont to allegorize on the literal sense of Scripture. His writings have a tincture of cabalistical refinement—and even occasionally glimmer with a ray of Grecian philosophy."—"The Epistle to the Romans is bewildered with the polemical Christianity of that day." His epistles, generally, are "filled with the abstruse discussions of Rabbinical learning; or relate to questions which are at present of more curiosity than importance."—"A modern believer has" (consequently) "very little concern with any of the epistles of this apostle;" or, indeed, it must be added, with any of the epistles, all of which this writer finds to be "involved in a tenfold obscurity;" and to which he pronounces it impossible that we could ever pay the smallest attention, but that "we prefer stumbling in darkness; that we delight more in error than in truth; or that we imagine there is no piety where there is no mystery."—*Picture of Christian Philosophy*, pref. pp. iv.—vi. pp. 131—132. See also *Guide to Immort.* vol. iii. pp. 230, 231, where the same point is again earnestly enforced. In another work (*Religion without Cant*, pp. 13, 14) the same author takes care to acquaint his reader more particularly with those pharisaical dogmas and heathenish notions, which Saint Paul had so deeply imbibed; and he illustrates the power of ancient prejudices over the mind of the apostle, by a happy and elegant allusion to the *tang of the tainted cask;* which, as he has presented it in a Latin phrase, likely to excite attention from its novelty, will, he thinks, give to "the sagacious" a sufficient idea of his meaning.

Of his meaning, in truth, no person can entertain a doubt. His language is plain and intelligible enough. It is neither more nor less than this, that Saint Paul, and, indeed, the authors of all the apostolical epistles, have shewn themselves to be mere drivellers: that we should consequently reject all their fancies; discard the hitherto received doctrines of Christianity as idle dreams; and regard the Gospel *merely* and *exclusively* as a *moral system*, or, as he chooses sometimes to term it, as a *rule of life*. This is the point which this writer mainly labours to establish throughout his various theological[2] publications. And, for the purpose of effecting this, he strenuously contends that the Christian religion contains in it *no* doctrine that is *mysterious*;[3] that it pronounces a good moral life to be the only requisite condition[4] of salvation; that in the Gospels alone are to be found comprised every useful truth, and every religious duty; and that, consequently, in his own work, which professes to give a just view of whatever the Gospels teach, the Christian reader will meet "a faithful and a cheering *Guide to Immortality*." The author goes yet farther: he holds, that our Saviour's Sermon on the Mount "contains a summary of every thing which it is necessary to believe or to practise." (*Anticalvinist*, pp. 13, 25.) So that even his own three volumes, explanatory of the true meaning of the four evangelists, are in a great degree superfluous; inasmuch as the substance of a few chapters which have been given by one of them, comprehends all that is actually requisite. This is undoubtedly making brief work with the writings of the New Testament: and, in this view of the case, he might with as much propriety have entitled his book, a *short cut*, as a *cheering guide*, *to immortality*.

---

[2] *The Anticalvinist*, *A Picture of Christian Philosophy*, *Religion without Cant*, and *The Guide to Immortality*, are the works with which this author has favoured the public on theological subjects. [Another theological work has, I understand, issued from the same pen, since the time at which this note was written: but what the nature of its contents may be, I confess I have not been anxious to discover.] Of these several volumes, all largely descanting upon the morality, to the disparagement, or rather to the exclusion, of the doctrines, of the Gospel, the Christian excellence which forms the favourite theme, is *benevolence*. It were well if he had treated those, from whose opinions he thinks proper to dissent, with that mildness, and brotherly forbearance, which might prove him to have written under the influence of the virtue which he so highly praises. His language, on the contrary, is every where that of the bitterest rancour, and the most arrogant contempt, against all who embrace the doctrines which he rejects, and which, in subscribing the articles of the church to which he belongs, he bound himself by a solemn promise to maintain. Nay, he even dooms to the place of future torments, in common with the most profligate and abandoned of sinners, all who have taught the "false and pernicious doctrines of innate depravity, imputed righteousness, and such other dogmas as are contrary to goodness."—*Guide to Immort.* vol. i. p. 316. Yet with all this gall perpetually discharging itself, charity and the kindly affections are the never-ending topics of declamation; a declamation even sometimes swelling into pindaric.

Love, indeed, of one kind or other, is with this writer so favourite a theme, that a late work, in which he has indulged in the effusions of poetry, is exclusively devoted to the subject. It must be confessed, however, that the love there treated of is as far removed from Christian love, as any that a Christian minister could feel himself justified in recommending.—*Poems chiefly descriptive of the softer and more delicate sensations and emotions of the heart!* Surely, surely, there is mischievous stuff enough of this kind abroad, without calling in the clergy to contribute their stock of silly love songs, to the increase of the nuisance.—And yet, perhaps, the love-songs of this clergyman are not more mischievous than his theology. They certainly are not more poetic.

[3] "In the following work, it will perhaps be objected, that I have introduced no mysteries: but whatever is mysterious is unnecessary. The essentials of a religion consist in few, and those the plainest truths."—"False religions may extol the importance of mysteries: but there is no mystery in the true."—*Guide to Immortality*, vol. i. pref. p. xiv.—Similar language is scattered plentifully amongst the pages of this work. Being thus prepared to render all perfectly smooth throughout the Gospels, and the Epistles being altogether discarded, our author proceeds with his pruning-knife in his hand, and freely and unsparingly lops or bends every thing to his own wish, and, as he conceives, to the great edification of his reader. And yet, strange to say, notwithstanding his *plain reasoning*, which "all men in the possession of reason may understand," he has left behind him mysteries not less than those which he boasts to have removed; if that which cannot be comprehended be allowed to be mysterious. Amongst many such, his observa-

But that we may appreciate the more justly the value of this writer's theological opinions, it is necessary to observe, that, whilst he every where[5] insists on the propriety of confining the entire range of Christian instruction within the limits of our Lord's discourses, as recorded by the evangelists, he at the same time very candidly informs us, that some of the grandest and most important truths of Christianity were not made known to the apostles until after their Master's death. "The great mystery of a suffering Messiah," he says, (and with what consistency he talks of such a mystery, or of any mystery whatever, let the reader judge,) "could not prudentially be explained, and was not openly and unreservedly taught, till after his resurrection." (*Guide*, &c. vol. i. p. 344.) In the sentence preceding this, he takes care to state distinctly, that, during the life of our Lord, this knowledge was withheld even from his immediate followers. Neither could it have been communicated to them in the interval between the resurrection and ascension, consistently with the representation of the case which this author gives; for he particularly acquaints us (which he admits to be more than the evangelists themselves have done) with the subjects of our Lord's discourse during that interval. "It was principally occupied with instructions relative to their (the apostles') ministry," &c. But "all things necessary for the belief or the practice of men, and which are essential to salvation, our Lord had repeatedly inculcated on his disciples before his death." And, accordingly, "the apostles delivered nothing necessary to salvation, which Christ had not previously enjoined in his discourses to his disciples; and of which we have a copious summary in the writings of the evangelists." (*Guide*, &c.

---

tions upon the Incarnation and the Atonement supply notable specimens. The very opening of his work, indeed, cannot fail to satisfy all who examine it, of his qualifications as a commentator, who is to remove from the sacred writings all the obscurities of mystery. Confessing that he cannot discover what meaning should be assigned to the word Λόγος, he "gives no translation to this mysterious term, but retains in the text the original word *Logos*, to which he leaves every reader to annex whatever interpretation he may think best." (Vol. i. p. 3.)—This is certainly a new mode of removing a difficulty: and Mr Fellowes is evidently not quite satisfied with it himself. He, therefore, in the succeeding notes, calls in the aid of Dr Lardner, and labours, with the help of this Socinian ally, to explain the nature of that, the term to express which he does not venture to translate. And now the matter comes out, that this *Logos*, let the word mean what it may, must actually be *God himself*. For if it be the reason, the wisdom, or the power of God, then what but God himself can it be? Thus the first point gained in making the matter plain, is, that the *attribute* of any being is that *being*. Well, then, this *Logos* is actually *God himself*. How goes on the *plain reasoning* now? "In the beginning was God; and God was with God; and God was God." So far there is no mystery undoubtedly; nor yet in the succeeding assurance, that "God was in the beginning with God." And for such communications, it must be conceded to Mr Fellowes and his Socinian auxiliaries, that the evangelists could have but little need of inspiration. But as we advance a little farther, we find that this *Logos*, (that is, *God*,) is called *The Light*; and that this *Light*, which in one verse is *God*, becomes, in the next, the *Messiah*, "the visible image of the wisdom of God;" and that immediately after it becomes *God* again.—See the notes, pp. 3—7, vol. i. of *Guide*, &c.) So much for the freedom from mystery, and clearness of exposition, in which this author exults; and for the want of which he every where indulges in the most indignant invectives against such as give support to the creeds and articles of the Established Church; all of whom, indiscriminately, he never fails to abuse as ignorant and intolerant, in a manner that evidently marks where these terms may justly be applied.

A glance at the exposition of the introductory verses of St John's Gospel, as given in pp. 25, 26, of this work will satisfy the reader, with what associates this Church of England divine is to be ranked in his comments upon Scripture.

[4] *Guide to Immor.* vol. i. p. 327.—This is also the familiar language of Mr Fellowes throughout. The clergy, he says, (vol. i. p. 323,) "ought solely and exclusively to be the *moral teachers* of the people." (He means to say, that the clergy "ought to be solely and exclusively *moral* teachers of the people.") Indeed he carries this point so far, that he would have "the ministers of the Establishment compelled to teach nothing but that pure morality which Christ taught, without cant or mystery."—*Religion without Cant*, p. 131.—It has been remarked of the work so entitled,—which deals, *usque ad nauseam*, in the cant or common-place usual with a certain class of writers on the subjects of *liberality*, *benevolence*, *morality*, &c. blended, at the same time, (in the indulgence, it is to be presumed, of benevolent and moral feelings,) with no small portion of the cant of invective against all the supporters of the Established religion,—that instead of being denominated *Religion without Cant*, it might, by a slight transposition, have acquired a much more appropriate description, *Cant without Religion*.

[5] Besides what has been already quoted upon this subject, in the preceding page, we find the following remarks in this writer's *Guide to Imm.* vol. iii. p. 231:—"Those who prefer religious speculation to the practice of religion, or who wish to keep alive the memory and to rekindle the heat of controversies, whose lustre and whose interest have long since been lost in the night of ages, may dedicate the best portion of their days to the fruitless study of that imperviously dark and inextricably bewildering polemical matter, which is still preserved in the apostolical epistles."—"But the precepts of Christ, as they are contained in his various parables and discourses in the four evangelists, contain all the instructions which are necessary to our improvement in righteousness—include, in short, every essential principle of genuine Christianity."

vol. iii. pp. 229, 230.)—What now follows from all this?—That "the great mystery of a suffering Messiah" is of no importance in the Christian scheme. For nothing is important that is not contained in our Lord's discourses delivered before his death, and as they are given to us by the evangelists; and in these discourses, we are told, the subject of a suffering Messiah is carefully suppressed.

But we have not yet done with the *variety* of the author's views upon this head. He has again and again assured us, that our Lord had, in several discourses before his death, communicated to his disciples every important truth; and yet he freely confesses, in other places, that there were several important truths which were not so communicated, but which our Lord had promised to convey to his disciples by the Spirit of truth, whom he would send to them after his death. (*Guide*, vol. iii. p. 64.)—It is true, indeed, that as to this *Holy Spirit*, or *Paraclete*, Mr Fellowes questions,[6] (p. 63,) whether it may not simply signify Christ's *resurrection and ascension!*" This, however, he proposes only to the "dispassionate and deep-thinking."—But what again shall we say of the evangelical narration, as Mr Fellowes describes the matter in another place? (p. 68.) "After my resurrection, I will declare to you the will and counsels of the Father without any indistinctness or obscurity." And yet to this he immediately subjoins: "The sacred historians have only *very briefly* recited the discourses of Jesus with his disciples after his resurrection."—Thus, then, "the will and counsels of the Father," the "expounding in all the Scriptures (beginning from Moses and all the prophets) the things concerning himself,"—which were vouchsafed by Christ to his disciples after his resurrection, and which the evangelists have (not "briefly," but) not at all "recited," are to be sought for precisely where it is confessed that they are not: and the Gospels are alone to be referred to, for clear and distinct views of doctrines which the Gospels do not contain: whilst that part of Scripture is to be rejected as unnecessary, and even injurious, which was specially allotted to the purpose of communicating to mankind that knowledge of the truth, which the Spirit of truth, as well as the words of our Lord, conveyed to the apostles, subsequent to his resurrection.

Thus we find this writer, who is to clear away all mystery and difficulty from Scripture truth, perpetually at variance with himself, no less than with the real doctrines of Christianity. Surely, he should have endeavoured to form at least a consistent set of opinions, before he attempted to obtrude them on the public; and, more particularly, before he ventured to fly in the face of the whole Christian world, by an open rejection of one of the most important portions of inspired Scripture. Humility, however, is not one of the weaknesses of this writer; and certainly knowledge is not his *forte*. Any reply to the arguments advanced by Mr Fellowes, for the rejection of the Epistles in the investigation of the Christian doctrines, is rendered unnecessary by the arguments themselves. Independent of their extravagance, (I had almost said, their folly,) they carry in them, as we have seen, their own refutation. In truth, the object of our Saviour's life was to supply the subject, not to promulgate the doctrines, of the Gospel. The evangelists, therefore, confine themselves to the simple duty of narration; and the doctrines, which altogether depended upon what our Lord had done and suffered, particularly upon his death, resurrection, and ascension into heaven, were, after this groundwork was fairly laid, to be fully set forth by those, to whom our blessed Saviour had solemnly promised the unerring aid of the Holy Spirit, and who were especially designated by him for that very purpose. See p. 122, for farther observations upon the attempt made by Dr Priestley and his Socinian phalanx, similar to this of Mr Fellowes, to beat down the authority of the Epistles. By rejecting the Epistles, or, which is the same thing, the doctrines which they contain, Mr Fellowes, indeed, thinks that he may[7] reconcile "Jews, Turks, and infidels of whatever denomination," to Christianity. (*Guide*, &c. vol. i. pref. p. xv.) — No; that he will not effect: but he will accomplish this, — he will render Christianity very little different from what Jews, Turks, and infidels, have already embraced.

---

[6] "It is a question which may be proposed to calm, and dispassionate, and deep-thinking men, whether our Lord, under the idea of a paraclete or counsellor, spoke of his resurrection and ascension; events which so greatly contributed to dispel the prejudices, to enlighten the minds, and to elevate the hearts of his disciples; and, in short, to lead them into all truth." So much for plain, unrefined, natural exposition. Now if, in speaking of the Comforter that was to be sent, our Lord meant his resurrection and ascension, it is evident that we may substitute these words for that which they imply, wherever it is spoken of. And then, our Lord's address to his disciples would run thus:—"If I go not away, my resurrection and ascension will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him (that is, my resurrection and ascension) unto you. And when he is come," &c. "However, when he cometh, even the Spirit of truth, (or, in other words, my resurrection and ascension,) he will guide you unto all truth: for he (that is my resurrection and ascension) will not speak of himself," &c. I certainly must leave this to "the dispassionate and deep-thinking," for I find it quite beyond the reach of *my* comprehension.

[7] Upon this prudential plan of clearing away mysteries from Christianity, in order to bring infidels of all descriptions within its pale, I cannot avoid noticing the observations of a writer, whose opinions deserve at least as much respect as those of Mr Fellowes. "As to the mysterious articles of our faith, which infidels would by no means have us forget; 'Who,' say they, 'can swallow them?' In truth, none but those who think it no dishonour to their understandings to credit their Creator. Socinus, like our infidels, was one of a narrow throat; and out of a generous compassion to the Scriptures, (which the world, it seems, had misunderstood for 1500 years,) was for weeding them of their mysteries; and rendering them, in the plenitude of his infallible reason, undisgusting and palatable to all the rational part of mankind. 'Why should honest Jews and Turks be frighted from us by the Trinity?' &c. He was for making religion familiar and inoffensive. And so he did; and *unchristian* too." The same admirable writer subjoins. "Those things which our hands can grasp, our understandings cannot comprehend. Why then deny to the Deity himself, the privilege of

Thus, then, upon the whole, it is manifest, that we have the very essence of Socinianism presented to us by a writer, in the garb of a minister of the Established Church: a writer, too, who expatiates in every page on the moral virtues, — on the virtues of truth, honesty, and fidelity, — whilst he openly boasts of the good policy of continuing in the bosom of that communion which he labours to subvert; and exultingly avows his breach of those solemn engagements, by virtue of which he obtained admission within its pale. Such plain and unenlightened Christians, as have not acquired a relish for the refinements, which enable an ingenious casuist to violate his promise and to betray his trust, will be apt to suspect that, in this author's hands, Christianity has not only been abridged of its mysteries, but also curtailed somewhat in its morality. For what do those Articles contain, to which every clergyman of the Established Church has declared his entire and unfeigned assent, but the very doctrines which this gentleman ridicules and rejects? Surely, the doctrines of the *Trinity*, the *Incarnation*, the *Redemption*, and the various other momentous Christian truths, which they pronounce to be indispensable to the formation of a genuine Christian faith, are not to be found comprised in the Sermon on the Mount, which this author maintains to be a "summary of every thing, which it is necessary to believe or to practise."

It is, indeed, scarcely conceivable, how a person in the possession of a sane understanding can reconcile to himself subscription to the articles of any Church, and rejection of the doctrines which those articles define. To say, as this author does, that the *sixth* article, in pronouncing that nothing is to be received as an article of faith which is not founded in Holy Writ, supplies a dispensation from the obligation of the rest, is to make as short work with the articles of the Church, as he has already made with the canon of Scripture. Would it not, under these circumstances, have saved much unnecessary trouble, to reduce the articles of the Church to the single declaration of the sixth? Or, indeed, were we to seek the simplicity, which this author so strongly recommends, the sixth article itself must be yet farther reduced, to correspond to the just dimensions of Gospel truth; and the whole that our Church should pronounce to be requisite for the true belief of a Christian teacher, should at once be confined to the range of Christ's Sermon on the Mount. But, to a person not desirous of escaping from the obligations of a solemn engagement, it would naturally occur, that the Church, in propounding certain articles of belief, could never have acted so absurdly, as to superadd to these one paramount article, which was to do away the obligation of all the rest. On the contrary, he would necessarily reason thus: that whilst certain doctrines are proposed as articles of faith, and it is at the same time declared that none are to be received as such, which are not founded on the authority of Scripture; it is clearly intended to be conveyed, that the articles proposed *are* founded upon that authority, and to be received as articles of faith by those *only* who conceive them to be so founded.

The language which Mr Fellowes's reasoning would put into the mouths of the framers of the articles is rather whimsical. "*For the purpose of avoiding diversities of opinion, and the establishing of consent touching true religion*,[8] we require from the clergy of the Established Church of England an unfeigned assent to the several doctrines which we propose; and for the better effecting the aforesaid purpose, we also require of them, each for himself, according to his private interpretation of Scripture, to modify or to reject these doctrines at pleasure, and to introduce such diversities of opinion as they may respectively think fit." This is Mr Fellowes's view of the matter. I would suggest to him a view of it somewhat different, in the words of one of the most distinguished ornaments of the English Church at the present day. "'I do willingly and *ex animo* subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England,' is the indispensable form of subscription; and therefore it behoves every one, before he offers himself a candidate for holy orders, to peruse carefully the Articles of our Church, and to compare them with the written word of God. If, upon mature examination, he believes them to be authorized by Scripture, he may conscientiously subscribe them; but if, on the contrary, he thinks that he sees reason to dissent from any of the doctrines asserted in them, no hope of emolument or honour, no dread of inconvenience or disappointment, should induce him to express his solemn assent to propositions, which, in fact, he does not believe."[9]—Bishop Tomline's

---

being one amidst that multitude of mysteries which he has made?" Such are the striking and just reflections of the celebrated Dr Young, on this important subject, in his *Centaur not Fabulous*, (p. 14;) a work which, in this age of frivolity, voluptuousness, and irreligion, I would particularly recommend to the attention of my young reader, promising him in the perusal, not less entertainment from the liveliness of its illustrations and the brilliancy of its wit, than improvement from the soundness of its reasonings and the animation of its piety.

[8] The *title* of our Articles, in describing the object for which they are framed, uses the very words which are here printed in Italics.

[9] Dr Balguy, in speaking of the duties of the clergy, touching

Elements, &c. vol. ii. p. 567.) According to Mr Fellowes's reasoning, on the other hand, a Christian minister may express his solemn assent to propositions, which, in fact, he does not believe. And this is the writer who resolves the whole of Christianity into morality.

Juravi linguâ, mentem injuratam gero, is a sentiment which has seldom been so openly avowed as by this gentleman. The dishonest subterfuge of mental reservation has been often charged upon that church, against whose corruptions it has been the glory of ours to protest. It might[10] now with justice be retorted upon our own, if, indeed, it could (as I confidently trust it cannot) reasonably be supposed, that opinions on the subject of subscription, similar to those entertained by Mr Fellowes, prevail in any degree amongst the clergy of the establishment.

But, after all, we do not find this gentleman completely satisfied with his own views of the subject. In the wish, which he expresses,[11] that Parliament should give relief from all subscriptions to doctrine, it is manifest, that he is not altogether contented with the dispensation, which he conceives the sixth article to supply. Whether Parliament, however, grant such relief or not, his free spirit is not to be restrained. "When the Church of England got rid of *one* Pope, it never intended to raise up *thirty-nine* in its place,"[12] (p. xxi.) And if the Church presume to do so, he is, at all events, released from such iniquitous exercise of authority, by a duty of higher obligation — the duty which he owes to the great spiritual King. (Pp. xxi. — xxiii.) But it may be asked, whether this duty authorizes him to betray his trust, by voluntarily continuing a member of a particular communion, which he labours, in violation of the most solemn engagements, to overturn; labours to overturn, by the very means which his connection with that communion supplies; and the enjoyment of which means, he pretty plainly intimates to be the principal cause for which he maintains that connection. (Pp. xix. xx.)

It is, however, but fair to state, that, in this deliberate endeavour to overturn the doctrines which the Articles enforce, this author considers himself by no means chargeable with a violation of his engagements. The argument, indeed, is somewhat new. It amounts to this: that he who attends to the direct, natural, and obvious meaning of the Articles, is least likely to arrive at their right construction: and that, as to the letter, they are in truth more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Whoever doubts this to be a fair representation, may turn to the pages last referred to; and also to pp. 33—42, of *Relig. without Cant*, where we find the author more fully unfolding the entire mystery of his reasoning upon this subject; for *mystery* and *paradox* this author does not dislike, where they are of his own creation. It is there laid down, authoritatively, that the true meaning of the Articles is not to be collected from the Articles themselves, but from the sense of the clergy at large; who, it is affirmed, "may put *any* construction[13] upon

---

the Articles, affirms, that "every word that comes from our mouths in opposition to the established faith, is a violation of the most solemn engagements, and an act of disobedience to lawful authority."

[10] It has, in truth, been retorted, in a late publication, by a Roman Catholic writer, and directed even against those of our clergy, who conceive themselves to be bound by their subscription to consider the Articles merely as articles of peace. Even of these this author pronounces, that they must be allowed to have acted under impressions "contrary to every principle of Christian sincerity, and favourable to perjury." What then would the same writer have said of a minister of the Established Church, who, so far from viewing those Articles, to which he had solemnly declared his unfeigned assent, as articles of peace, openly arraigns them as grossly antiscriptural, and professes it to be his determination to oppose and to overturn them by every means in his power? The passage to which I have referred, is to be found at p. lvi. of the introduction to a work, entitled *The Protestant Apology for the Roman Catholic Church.* The author of the introduction (who styles himself Irenæus) possesses ability and information worthy of a better cause than that which he has undertaken to support; and many things have fallen from his pen, in that treatise, which well deserve the consideration of Protestant divines. I mention this the more willingly, because it has not been my lot to meet with publications by any late writer of the Romish Church, alike deserving of notice.

[11] *Guide to Imm.* vol. i. pp. xviii. xix.

[12] It is curious to observe this advocate for Christian freedom, who spurns with such indignation these popes which are imposed by the authority of the Church, devising, at the same time, a pope of his own, to which he would have the whole body of the clergy compelled to bend the knee. For, as we have already seen, (note [4] p. 212,) his favourite plan is, that the ministers of the establishment should be *compelled* to teach nothing but pure morality. Thus, like most of the other mighty advocates for freedom, the liberty which he wishes for, is merely the liberty to deprive others of theirs.

[13] Dr Paley, a writer certainly not of the same stamp with Mr Fellowes, gives a very different account of this matter. "Subscription to articles of religion, though no more than a declaration of the subscriber's assent, may properly enough be considered in connection with the subject of oaths, because it is governed by the same rule of interpretation; which rule is the *animus imponentis.* The inquiry, therefore, concerning subscription, will be, *quis imposuit, et quo animo?*"— (*Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, p. 148.) This is manifestly an inquiry of a nature very far removed from that which Mr Fellowes recommends to us. And, although I cannot agree with Dr Paley, either as to his general notion of the intent of the Articles, or as to his idea, that the *animus imponentis* terminates with the legislature that enacted them, yet it cannot, I think, be reasonably denied, that he proposes the true principle of their interpretation. A just corrective of the laxity with which Dr Paley applies that principle, may be found in Mr Gisborne's *Principles of Moral Philosophy*, pp. 190—192. To this work, as well as to Bishop Tomline's *Elements*, I would earnestly advise the divinity student to resort for accurate notions upon this subject. Very loose opinions have been scattered abroad, by various writers, upon this point; a point which, of all others, demands a most conscientious precision. But of all these writers, none, perhaps, of any note, has advanced a more relaxed system, than the late Cambridge professor, Dr Hey, who, in his *Lectures on Divinity*, however much of learning and good sense they may otherwise contain, has certainly merited the charge made by Bishop Law, of leading the members of the Church "into all the labyrinths of a loose and a perfidious casuistry." (Vol. ii. p. 13.) His description of the nature of the tacit repeal adopted by the

them which they think best:" that, "according to that construction, the Articles may and ought to be subscribed;" and that he, who thus subscribes them, inasmuch as he maintains a unity of doctrine with the majority of his brethren, "is a better friend to the Church of England, than he is who may subscribe the Articles in a sense more agreeable to the letter," &c. Thus, we are informed by a writer, who boasts of not submitting his opinions to authority, that we are not to exercise our private judgment in discovering the true sense of the Articles, but to take it entirely on trust from others. This, however, turns out, in the conclusion, to be, after all, but a convenient mode of rendering the whole dependent upon the judgment of the very individual who thus modestly disclaims its exercise. For, since all is now to be decided by the suffrage of the clergy, and since there is no practicable contrivance whereby this suffrage can be numerically collected, the sense of the majority must, of course, be precisely that which each individual may conceive it to be. But, again, as it is not merely "the majority of the living members," but "particularly the most learned, upright, and judicious members of the Church of England, that constitute that Church;" it must be the sense of the majority of these, it is manifest, that is to determine the point. Now, who are the most learned, upright, and judicious members of that Church? These clearly can be no other than they who reject all mystery; who make Christianity nothing but a moral rule; who can discern in it nothing more than Dr Priestley, or Mr Belsham, or any other free expositor, who would divest it of all its peculiarities; who, in short, agree with Mr Fellowes, in pronouncing the entire sum and substance of the Christian religion to be comprised in Christ's Sermon on the Mount. Thus, then, it appears that our author ends where he began, and that the true meaning of the Articles, as well as the genuine sense of Scripture, is to be collected only from him who has supplied us with *The Guide to Immortality*.

Now, what is all this less than insanity? But it is the insanity of a vain mind, of which we see too many instances on religious subjects daily. Well might a periodical writer, whose attachment to religious truth entitles him to general praise, describe this writer as "presumptuous, idolizing his own conceptions, and fancying his own reason infallible, and cutting short the line of faith exactly where it happens to interfere with their suggestions.—Already," it is added,[14] "he is a latitudinarian in the widest sense of the word: the natural progress is from that to a fanciful, self-willed, merely nominal Christian; making even the Gospels bend to his own whim. From this point the descent to Deism, or even Atheism, is perfectly easy; nor do we know, indeed, that a Deist differs much, except in name, from such a Christian."

Mr Fellowes has, it is true, congratulated himself on his good fortune, in being the subject of these animadversions of the *British Critic;* as they have furnished the occasion of his "receiving so much elegance of praise from one who is equally distinguished by the vigour of his intellect, and the fervour of his benevolence." (*Relig. without Cant*, pref. p. xxxviii.) That Dr Parr has proved his *benevolence* by the high panegyric which he has bestowed upon Mr Fellowes, there can be no question; but whether he has done equal credit to his *intellect*, or, what is of more consequence, whether he has served the cause of truth and of Christianity, by such indulgence of that amiable feeling, is certainly much to be doubted. Had Dr Parr confined himself to the testimony which he has borne to the purity and benevolence [15] displayed in the private life of Mr Fellowes, as he is a competent, so he would

---

Church of Geneva, (vol ii. p. 56,) and his manifest recommendation of it as an example to be followed by other churches, will supply a sufficient proof of this assertion.—Dr Powell, again, another eminent member of the University of Cambridge, has given but too much colour, by certain expressions of his in his *Discourse on Subscriptions*, for the wild opinions of Mr Fellowes upon this subject; although, when well considered, and in connection with the context, they will be found to give him no support. The following observations of this writer deserve to be quoted. Speaking of the subscription of the clergy, he says; "Our Articles of religion are not merely articles of peace. They are designed also as a test of our opinions. For, since it cannot be imagined, that men should explain with clearness, or enforce with earnestness, or defend with accuracy of judgment, such doctrines as they do not believe, the Church requires of those who are appointed to teach religion, a solemn declaration of their faith. Nor is it more unreasonable to exclude a man from this office, who, through error, unavoidable, suppose, and innocent error, is unfit to execute it; than to deny him a civil employment, for which he is accidentally disqualified. He, therefore, who assents to our Articles, must have examined them, and be convinced of their truth." Dr Powell's *Discourses on various Subjects*, pp. 33, 34. The whole of this passage is well worthy of attention.

[14] It should be observed, that these remarks were drawn forth by one of the earliest of this writer's performances. He has since travelled farther in the same direction; and given additional proof of the justice of those animadversions, and the truth of those prognostics.

[15] Dr Parr speaks in terms altogether unmeasured of the benevolent and charitable feelings which uniformly govern the life and guide the pen of Mr Fellowes. And yet it is an extraordinary effect of those benevolent and charitable feelings, that he should every where throughout his writings pour forth the language of virulence and contempt against all who support the creeds and articles of the Church, against all, in short, who deem any thing beyond his abridged form of Christianity necessary for a Christian. Perhaps even from the writings of the most illiberal bigot a stronger instance of the want of charity cannot be adduced than that which this author supplies, (as has been noticed, p. 211,) in speaking of those, who "teach the false and pernicious doctrines of *innate depravity, imputed righteousness*," &c. In short, it is of a writer, who has war continually in his mouth, that Dr Parr pronounces peace to be for ever in his heart. It is almost ludicrous to see such a writer represented as using in his own person the language of Grotius, "Pacem amavi semper amoque," even in the qualified sense in which this pacific disposition is described. (*Spital Sermon*,

have been admitted to be an unexceptionable witness. But, in speaking of an author, whose works are before the public, Dr Parr, however highly his learning and talents may be (and highly they ought to be) rated, yet cannot possibly expect, that the opinion which he thinks fit to pronounce upon that author's productions, shall necessarily regulate the public decision. Perhaps, indeed, in the declarations which this classical and most elaborate writer has hazarded on the subject of Mr Fellowes's theological publications, although nothing can shake his reputation as a scholar, he may not have added much to his character as a divine. For when he tells us that he finds but "two or three points of controversial divinity in which he dissents from Mr Fellowes," (who, in *almost every point* of controversial divinity, dissents from the Articles of the Established Church,) and that he discovers scarcely any thing to be objected to, except "that Mr Fellowes does not assent to some positions of Mr Wilberforce[16] about original sin; for the attempt to refute whom, some enlightened believers may applaud, and some orthodox churchmen would pardon him:"—when he tells us these things, he proves beyond a doubt, either that he has perused Mr Fellowes's writings with an eye of blameable partiality, where the cause of religious truth demanded an honest search, and even a piercing scrutiny; or that his own opinions hang but loosely and uncertainly upon the point of orthodoxy. Dr Parr needs not to be informed that the truths of Christianity are not to be conceded even to the amiable sympathies of friendship; nor their just measure and degree to be accommodated to the formation of a polished and a pointed sentence. It were to be wished, that in his praises of Mr Fellowes he had not selected, as a mark of his *sense*, his being "a Christian without bigotry." It certainly, on the other hand, is not to be wondered at, that Mr Fellowes has returned the compliment, by describing his eloquent encomiast, as "a priest without intolerance and without guile." The reciprocal panegyric might surely have been rendered sufficiently palatable, without the seasoning of illiberal aspersions upon Christianity and its priesthood.

Dr Parr, for whose general character and talents, I feel, in common with all who can appreciate integrity and genius, a sincere and unaffected reverence, may think that I have spoken too strongly upon this subject. But the impress of his praise is no slight matter; and the danger of its giving a circulation to what ought not (and without it, perhaps, would not) obtain currency with the public, demands an open exposure of the baseness of the coin, to which it would attach a fictitious value.

In truth, mischievous as are the publications of Mr Fellowes, I should not have thought it necessary to animadvert upon them in this place, but that the eloquent eulogies of Dr Parr, joined to the writer's presenting himself to the public as a clergyman of the establishment, might, by throwing young readers off their guard as to the true character and object of his works, expose them to be misled by the false lights of a treacherous guide. To such readers, the *satis eloquentiæ, sapientiæ parum*, of the author, is imposing; the specious gloss of liberality and benevolence which his writings wear, is attractive; the classic authority of his splendid panegyrist is commanding. And as it was for readers of this description, especially for students of divinity intended for holy orders, that the present work was originally designed, it naturally falls within its province to endeavour to secure them against such snares, when calculated to entrap them into false notions of their duties as professors of a Christian faith, or of their engagements as members of a national clergy.

No. LXXIII. — Page 22. Col. 2.

THE ATONEMENT BY THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST MORE STRICTLY VICARIOUS THAN THAT BY THE MOSAIC SACRIFICES, WHEREBY IT WAS TYPIFIED.

The justness of the position here laid down will be readily perceived, not only from the observations in p. 22, but yet more fully from comparing what has been said in Numbers XXXVIII. and XXXIX. on the vicarious import of the legal sacrifices, with the remarks in Number XLII. on the true and *essentially vicarious* sacrifice of Christ. The

---

p. 82.) Dr Parr's universal acquaintance with the ancient classics will readily suggest to him whose language I use, when (without being deterred by the "tales pacis hostes insurrecturos," &c.) I beg to substitute for the foregoing the following description, as more aptly illustrative of the character of his friend:—῞Ωϛε εἰ τις, αὐτοὺς ξυνέλων, φαίη πεφυκέναι ἐπὶ τῷ μήτε αὐτοὺς ἔχειν ἡσυχίαν, μήτε τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους ἐᾷν, ὀρθῶς ἂν εἴποι.

[16] Dr Parr, in speaking of the state of his mind respecting the book published by this excellent man, and sincere Christian, which gave rise to the strictures of Mr Fellowes, says, that the description of it lies in the following narrow compass:—τὰ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, οὐ μέμνημαι; τα δὲ μέσα, οὐ συνίημι; τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, οὐ δοκιμάζω. Now although there be some opinions in Mr Wilberforce's work, to which I am as unwilling to apply the δοκιμάζω as Dr Parr can be; yet I cannot help thinking, that it would neither have discredited his discernment to have understood the reasoning, nor his taste and piety to have stored his memory with many of the results which it contains. I confess, I think it but a bad symptom of the times, when even grave characters can be found to join in the vulgar ridicule of distinguished piety: when religious seriousness but serves as a ground for ludicrous denominations and sarcastic epithets; and these too not confined to the light and the malevolent, but receiving a partial sanction from the philosopher and the divine, and even admitted with more than toleration in one of the great assemblies, with whose morality and corruption those of the entire people of these nations are vitally interwoven.

reflections contained in pp. 94, 103, 104, should be particularly attended to, as pointing out the due *proportion* of the Mosaic and Christian atonements. See also pp. 21, 22, and Number LXVIII. and pp. 189, 190.

I subjoin here a very extraordinary paragraph, which I find in a treatise of Danzius *De Λύτρῳ Redemptionis humanæ*, on the subject of an admission by the Jews of the vicarious suffering of the *Son* for the sins of men, pursuant to an eternal compact with the *Father* to that end. "Consentiunt hic nobismet Judæi, scilicet Deum Patrem cum Filio suo jam ab æterno de redimendo humano genere consilium iniise. Hinc notabilem quendam hâc de re inter Deum et Messiam dialogum, per fabulam, fingunt: quem ex Helvico hic apponere placet, qui eundem ex R. Mos. Haddarschan, super Gen. i. 3, excerpsit, et ita sonat; 'Dixit Jehova sanctus Benedictus, Messia juste mi! isti, qui sunt reconditi apud te, hujusmodi erunt, quod futurum, ut peccata eorum inducant te in jugum grave, &c. Respondit coram eo Messias, Domine mundi! Ego quidem lætus suscipio super me tribulationes istas, sive tormenta: eo tamen pacto, ut tu in diebus meis vivifices mortuos, et eos, qui a primo Adamo usque ad illud tempus mortui fuerint, &c. Dixit ei Sanctus Benedictus, Concedo. Protinus igitur suscepit ex dilectione super se Messias tormenta omnia et tribulationes, sicut scriptum est, Ies. LIII. *afflictus ipse, et angustiatus est.*'"— Meuschen. *Nov. Test. ex Talm.* p. 850. This extract I give to the reader as matter of curiosity.

No. LXXIV. — Page 22. Col. 2.

CONCLUDING NUMBER.

Those objections, the discussion of which would have been improper and impracticable from the pulpit, have been carefully canvassed in the preceding dissertations. It has been the wish of the author to notice *all* that seemed in any degree deserving of attention. They who are acquainted with the subject, will, it is hoped, do him the justice to allow that he has omitted none of moment. Whether he has been as successful in their refutation, as he has been industrious in their collection, it is for others to judge. This, at least, he can venture to affirm, that he has examined them with a conscientious regard to truth and Scripture. And he now concludes this inquiry with an humble, and not unanxious hope, that the word of God may not have suffered in his hands.

APPENDIX,

CONTAINING AN ACCOUNT OF

THE UNITARIAN SCHEME,

AS DESCRIBED BY MR BELSHAM,

IN HIS REVIEW OF MR WILBERFORCE'S TREATISE;

WITH OCCASIONAL STRICTURES ON THE LEADING ARGUMENTS ADVANCED IN THAT PUBLICATION.

> " Οὕτως ἀταλαίπωρος τοῖς πολλοῖς ἡ ζήτησις τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἕτοιμα μᾶλλον τρέπονται." — *Thucyd.* lib. i. c. 20.
>
> " I like not that arrogant theology, which presumes to explore what *angels desire to look into*, and which, failing in its attempt, rejects as absurd what it is not able to understand." —*Bishop Watson's Charge in* 1795.
>
> " Aperte dicite non vos credere Christi Evangelio: nam qui in Evangelio quod vultis creditis, quod vultis non creditis, vobis potius quam Evangelio creditis." —*Aug. cont. Faust.* tom. vi. p. 336. ed. 1569.

In supplement to certain remarks in the preceding sheets, (particularly to those in pp. 10, 23—28, 42—45, 48—50,) it becomes necessary to exhibit a brief outline of the opinions of that sect, which, under the assumed title of Unitarian, has presumed to arrogate the exclusive profession of the *Divine Unity;* and which has of late years exerted itself, in the sister country, with uncommon zeal and activity, for the subversion of the doctrines and the establishment of the national religion.

An abstract, presenting at one view the leading principles and consequences of the system, divested of the imposing phraseology which writers of modern days know so well how to apply to all objects whether worthy or unworthy, may prove not less beneficial to some who have, than to others who have not, embraced its doctrines. The task, indeed, is not without its difficulty. To seize what is fugitive; to fix that which is ever in the act of change; to chain down the Proteus to one form, and to catch his likeness ere he has shifted to another; this is certainly a work not easy to be accomplished. What Unitarianism, however, was in the year[1] 1798, a writer, who professes himself its faithful interpreter and vindicator, has circumstantially detailed. Mr Belsham, the late theological teacher at Hackney, has, *ex officio*, announced the creed of the day: and, so far as the principle of dissent can admit concurrence, the doctrines which he has promulged may reasonably be presumed to be those generally received by the Dissenters of the Unitarian denomination throughout the sister country.

The scheme, as presented by this writer, in his *Review of Mr Wilberforce's Enquiry*, is briefly as follows.—Beginning with the existence of "an infinitely powerful, wise, and good Being, as the first and fundamental principle of rational religion," he pronounces the essence of this Being to be *love:* and from this he infers, as a demonstrable consequence, that none of the creatures formed by such a being, "will ever be made eternally miserable." To suppose the contrary, he maintains, is not only inconsistent with the Divine benevolence, but directly contradictory to the plainest principles of justice. That all will rise again after death, he admits to have been taught by Christ: and he likewise admits, that "the wicked will be raised to suffering." But, since God would act *unjustly* in inflicting "eternal misery for temporary crimes, the sufferings of the wicked can be but remedial, and will terminate in a complete purification from moral disorder, and in their ultimate restoration to virtue and happiness;[2] or, as he elsewhere[3] expresses it, "Moral evil must be expelled by the application of natural evil;" and, if not fully effected in this life, "the process must be carried on by the severer sufferings of a future retribution." Thus the doctrine of a *purgatory*[4] stands immovably fixed on the basis of the Divine justice: and the antithesis between *eternal* misery and *temporary* crimes is made to complete the demonstration of the Unitarian; by which he is not only enabled to communicate "confidence" and "tranquillity" to "the enlightened and virtuous believer,"[5] but, he might also have added, a hardened and fearless security to the impenitent offender: and without this, he contends, "the God of nature must be viewed as frowning over his works, and, like a merciless tyrant, dooming his helpless creatures to eternal misery," &c.[6] Whoever desires to see this curious specimen of reasoning fully examined and exposed, will find ample satisfaction in *Mr Walker's Letter to Mr Belsham*, pp. 40—42.

---

[1] This Appendix was originally drawn up in the year 1800. What have been the wanderings of the fugitive since that period, the author has had little leisure, and less inclination, to explore. He is also disposed to think, that full as much consequence has been already attached to the subject, as it is entitled to.

Having thus softened down the article of judicial retribution, and lightened guilt of most of its terrors, as well as of much of its deformity, (there being, as he contends, "a preponderance of virtue, even in characters contaminated with the grossest vice;"[7]) he naturally proceeds to depreciate the value of the *atonement by Christ.* The notion of his death, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men, Mr Belsham totally rejects: and the doctrine of redemption through his blood, he holds to be an entire mistake, founded in the misunderstanding of certain phrases peculiar to the Jews:[8] and finally, for the full establishment of his opinions, he refers us to Dr J. Taylor; the amount of whose reasoning on this head, "in his *admirable*[9] *Key*," as Mr Belsham finds convenient to call it, has been already examined at large, in the foregoing work, especially pp. 50—52, 54, 55, 85—88.

The merits and the sufferings of Christ having, in the scheme of this writer, no connection with the acceptance of man; the notion of his divine nature, and even that of his pre-existence, are discarded as wild chimeras. Jesus Christ he considers "as a man *in all respects* like to his brethren:" and he seems particularly anxious that the opinions of the Unitarian should not be confounded with those of Socinus; who, he says, whilst he properly maintains, "that Jesus had no existence before his birth, yet admits the unscriptural and most incredible notion, that, since his resurrection, he has been advanced to the government of the universe."[10] The father of Socinianism had but half accomplished the work of degrading the Son of God, whilst he allowed him a superiority over the human kind after death. Mr Belsham, with strict consistency, completes the system; and boldly contends, that as he differed in no respect from man in his mode of coming into the world, so can he have no dominion or superiority over him in the world of spirits. That he "is indeed now alive, and employed in offices the most honourable and benevolent," he does not attempt to deny: but since "we are totally ignorant of the place where he resides, and of the occupations in which he is engaged," he maintains, that "there can be no proper foundation for religious addresses to him, nor of gratitude for favours now received, nor yet of confidence in his future interposition in our behalf."[11] Thus, because we are ignorant of the *place* and *occupations* of the Son of God, is all entercourse between man and his Redeemer at an end! Thus says Mr Belsham. And so far is he from considering our blessed Lord as an object of religious address, that he can look upon him only as the "most excellent of *human* characters, the most eminent of all the prophets of God;" whose "memory he reveres," whose "doctrine he embraces," in whose "promises he confides," and to whose "authority he bows."[12]

To what then does Christianity amount, on Mr Belsham's plan? To nothing more than good habits; and these habits, the result of man's own unaided and independent exertions, or rather the result of external influences and irresistible impressions.[13] Those usually received, and (as Mr Wilberforce properly styles them,) *peculiar* doctrines of Christianity, which declare the *corrupted state of human nature*, the *atonement of the Saviour*, and the *sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit*, our author rejects as utterly inconsistent with truth and Scripture.[14] The preponderance of virtue over vice in the world at large, and with a very few, if any, exceptions, in every individual in particular, he maintains to be indisputable.[15] The practice of virtue, he pronounces to be the only ground of acceptance with God, without any regard to faith in Christ, to his merits, or his sufferings, all which he proscribes as notions unscriptural and absurd :[16] and as to the influence of the Holy Spirit being that which prompts to virtue, he finds little difficulty in expunging this likewise from his creed, being fully satisfied, "that the Scriptures do not teach the existence of any such person as the Holy Spirit, and that there is no ground for the expectation of any supernatural operation on the mind."[17] The sole incitements to virtuous conduct, spring, according to Mr Belsham, from "the circumstances in which men are placed, and the impressions to which they are exposed :"—"moral and religious habits not being acquired in any different way from other habits of mind :"[18] — that is, according to his reasoning, all being equally the result of a *necessary* operation : the religious tendency, as well as its opposite, naturally arising out of a certain "state of the brain ;"[19] and "habits growing by the influence of particular impressions, with the same regularity and certainty with which the fruits of the earth are produced and matured by the genial influence of the sun, and of the fructifying showers."[20]

---

[2] *Review*, &c. pp. 12—16.

[3] Pp. 41, 42.

[4] See, besides the above references, p. 154.

[5] P. 21.

[6] P. 20.

[7] Pp. 14, 38, 39, 40, 42.

[8] Pp. 17, 18, 105, 106.

[9] In a periodical publication, distinguished for the uprightness and talent with which it is conducted, there is to be found a series of valuable letters, upon the subject of the work above alluded to: and in the conclusion, the writer observes as follows, upon this "admirable Key."—"The key of this author is not, I am persuaded, the legitimate one. I should rather be tempted to resemble it to some of those false keys, vulgarly called picklocks. The web of the key, to speak technically, is, in those ingenious instruments, cut to as slender a form as is consistent with the strength necessary for turning the bolt, in order that the chance of the impediment from the wards may be as little as possible. But the lock, with which this theological adventurer had to do, was of such a peculiar construction, as to resist every effort to open it, except with the true key. The Doctor gave some desperate wrenches, and doubtless imagined that he had effected his purpose when he found the key turn in his hand. But it has been discovered by others, that he did no more than break it in the lock, and the bolt, for any thing which he has done to remove it, remains where it was before."—*Christ. Observ.* vol. vi. p. 504. The figure undoubtedly conveys no incorrect idea of the work which it is so much the fashion with Socinian writers, and with good reason, to extol.

[10] P. 74.

[11] P. 85.

[12] Pp. 84, 85.

[13] Pp. 170—175.

Thus does the advocate of human *merit* vindicate the *independency* of human virtue. Let us stop for a moment to examine this more fully. "Virtue[21] is a system of habits, conducing to the greatest ultimate happiness :"[22] "and men being the creatures of circumstances, the habits they form, whether good or bad, are the result of the impressions to which they are exposed ;"[23] or, as we have just seen, are the result of a *necessary* and *mechanical* operation, and arise out of causes independent of the agent, if such he can be called. Now, it seems natural to demand of this writer, in what respect his scheme differs from that part of the high doctrines of Calvin, which he most strongly reprobates? Does he not, equally with the reformer of Geneva, contend that man has nothing which he can call his own? Does he not, equally with him, reduce every action under the necessary and irresistible control of motives, in which the agent has no choice, and over which he can have no power? And does he not, whilst he thus concurs with the follower of Calvin, differ from himself, by abolishing the very idea of merit, whilst he makes merit the foundation of his system?

Mr Belsham, indeed, exerts all his ingenuity, as Dr Priestley had done before,[24] to escape from this resemblance to the Calvinist. The attempt, however, is vain. The Unitarian may fancy that he has provided a complete salvo for the difficulties of his system, and a clear distinction from that of the Calvinist, by substituting his notion of a *purgatory* for that of *eternal punishment*. But here the consequences with which he presses the Calvinist return upon himself. For, if it be inconsistent with "infinite justice and goodness to doom a being to *eternal misery*, for no other cause but that of not extricating himself out of the state in which his Creator placed him, without any power to act or will ;"[25] I would ask, by what principles of reasoning it can be reconciled to the same infinite justice and goodness, to doom to *temporary misery* a being placed in circumstances precisely similar ; that is, determined to one certain mode of action, by an indissoluble chain of motives, and an irresistible necessity. If the idea of *punishment* for that which was the result of inevitable necessity, be repugnant to the essential nature of *justice*, it must be equally so, whether that punishment be of long or of short duration. The *quantity* of the evil endured, if no evil *whatever* ought to be inflicted, can make no change in the nature of the case. The power that prolongs or heightens the punishment, where *no* punishment was deserved, may be more malignant, but cannot be more unjust. Thus, then, allowing to the Unitarian the full benefit of his *purgatorial*[26] scheme, (for which, however, Scripture supplies not the smallest foundation,) he is exposed, equally with the Calvinist, to the charge which he himself brings against the latter, of "impeaching the character of his Maker, and traducing his works."[27] Thus much for the *consequences* of the two systems.

---

[14] P. 170.

[15] Pp. 13, 14, 38, 39.

[16] Pp. 104, 105, 172, 173.

[17] P. 97.—See also pp. 70, 71, 76 — 79.

[18] Pp. 134, 148, 173, 180.

[19] P. 171.

[20] Pp. 174, 175.—also p. 41.

[21] Mr Belsham in his *Elements*, where it is his intention to convey his ideas in the most scientific form, defines virtue to be, "the tendency of an action, affection, habit, or character, to the ultimate happiness of the agent." (P. 371.) It is at the same time to be noted, that of this tendency the true and proper judge is the agent himself. What then follows? Why, plainly this, as Dr Price has properly objected, that, agreeably to this definition, "any the most pernicious and horrible effects will become just and fit to be produced by any being, if but the minutest degree of clear advantage or pleasure may result to him from them." (*Review of Morals*, p. 183.) Now how does Mr Cooper, who coincides in Mr Belsham's sentiments, reply to this? "Granted. But let God look to that. A future state of retribution has been ascertained for the very purpose of obviating this objection." Mr Belsham indeed admits, that "the expression is harsh, and hardly consistent with the reverence due to the Supreme Being ;" but contends "that the meaning is just, and the reply satisfactory." What! a retribution hereafter! Wherefore a retribution? Must a being, whose only business was to calculate the balance of advantage, suffer for a mistake in that calculation, when he made it with a view to that which alone he was bound to look to, his own advantage? And this, too, when he could not by any possibility have made a different calculation. For, as Mr Belsham informs us, (*Elements*, p. 391,) "the only difference between the most virtuous and the most vicious person is, that the former was placed in circumstances, and exposed to impressions, which generated virtuous habits and affections, and the latter in circumstances by which vicious principles and dispositions were produced :" the one so circumstanced as that he must unavoidably calculate right, and the other so circumstanced as that he must unavoidably calculate wrong. So much for the true distinction between virtue and vice.

[22] P. 38

[23] P. 41.

[24] *Philosoph. Necessity*, sect. xiii.

[25] *Review*, p. 58.

Again, as to the *principle* of necessity, it is precisely the same whether the Unitarian endeavour to dignify it by the title of *philosophical;* or degrade it by that of *predestinarian.* Or, if Mr Belsham will still pretend to differ from the follower of Calvin, whom he describes as, equally with himself, pronouncing man a *necessary* instrument, destitute of self-agency, it can only be in this; that whilst the latter makes man a *necessary* instrument in the hand of God, Mr Belsham's system admits the possibility of rescuing him from this slavish subjection to his Maker, by placing him under the irresistible control of *chance*, or *destiny*, or some other *equally* conceivable power. For, to suppose all the actions of man to spring necessarily from motives, and these motives the unavoidable result of external impressions and local circumstances; the divine Spirit giving no direction in the particular case, and the man having no power either to regulate their operation, or to resist their impulse; is to suppose all that the Stoic and the Atheist could desire.

Such is the exalted *merit* of man, fashioned by the deistical jargon of that which equally disgraces Christianity and philosophy, by assuming their names. Such are the lights afforded us by the *rational* Christian: who mends Calvinism by purgatory; secures to man a property in his actions, by rendering him the unresisting slave of motives; and maintains the interests of religion, by subjecting human conduct solely to the mechanical operations of secondary causes.

It is indeed extremely difficult to make out Mr Belsham's system. But it is one of the advantages of inconsistency, that the statement of the absurdities in one part of an argument is liable to be discredited by contradictory positions in another. Thus, whilst Mr Belsham repeatedly affirms that man is not to look to the influence and sustaining aid of the divine Spirit, but solely to his own exertions, or, as he most singularly explains these exertions, to circumstances and impressions which work upon his mind by a mechanical and necessary operation; he professes, in other places, not altogether to banish the notion of the divine agency. "We are," he says, "thankfully to ascribe all our improvements, our hopes, and our consolations, to God."[28] Mr Belsham has here struck a little out of the path to direct Atheism, in which he seemed before rapidly advancing: and this saving clause was indispensable to a writer who professes a belief in the existence of a God. But when we come to inquire on what ground our gratitude is due to a Being who has not contributed, by any beneficial influence, to the improvement of our virtue, we find our independence of a divine grace still carefully secured, inasmuch as the sole foundation of our thankfulness to the Supreme Being is, that "to his appointment, and continued agency, all causes owe their efficacy."[29] It is, then, for the original constitution and general arrangement of the works of nature alone, that we are to be grateful; and not for any special operation of a divine influence in any individual case. May we not, therefore, fairly apply to our philosopher, what Cicero pronounced of the refiners of ancient times, "*verbis* reliquisse Deos, *re* sustulisse?"

But, that we may the more perfectly understand our author's meaning, he supplies us with a specimen of the mode in which a judicious instructor should endeavour to reclaim a vicious person, desirous of reformation. Having first carefully guarded him against all unscriptural doctrines, such as original sin, atonement, merits of Christ, and the like; having warned him, not to expect any supernatural impressions upon his mind, nor to imagine that moral and religious habits are to be acquired in a way different from any other;

---

[26] The formal notion of a purgatory I find laid down by our author, in the philosophical treatise before alluded to, in which it is his professed object to give to students accurate and fundamental notions on all the leading subjects of morality and religion. That the precision of his ideas may not suffer in the reporting, I shall state them in his own words. "If there be a future life, the immediate condition of the great mass of mankind when they enter upon it must be a state of very considerable pain and suffering. For the great majority of human characters are alloyed with one or more vicious habits and affections. These must be put under a process of cure, more or less severe in proportion to the malignity of the moral disease."—*Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind*, p. 402. Our author also affirms that he has the testimony of Scripture for this doctrine. I apprehend it must be the *Second of Maccabees*, where others have pretended to find it also. Or, perhaps, as he has not joined in turning the doctrine to so good account as those who profess to have found it there, his authority has been of that classical nature which might better suit a philosopher.

> "Ergo exercentur pœnis, veterumque malorum
> Supplicia expendunt: aliæ panduntur inanes
> Suspensæ ad ventos; aliis sub gurgite vasto
> Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni.
> Quisque suos patimur Manes." *Æn.* Lib. vi.
>
> "For this are various penances enjoined;
> And some are hung to bleach upon the wind;
> Some plunged in waters, others plunged in fires,
> Till all the dregs are drained, and all the rust expires.
> All have their Manes, and those Manes bear."
> DRYDEN.

Pagans, Jews, Mahometans, and Papists, have heretofore held these notions: to these we must now add the Philosophical Unitarian.

[27] *Review*, p. 37.

[28] P. 175.

[29] Pp. 175, 180.

having pointed his attention, particularly, to those parts of Scripture which direct him to do justice, to love mercy, &c.; having urged him to fix in his mind just and honourable sentiments of God, as the greatest, wisest, and best of beings;"[30] he proceeds, more circumstantially, to the case of the offender; and beginning, in due form, with a definition of virtue, "as a course of conduct leading to the greatest ultimate happiness," and of vice, as "that which leads to misery;" he next lays before the sinner, (or, in the milder vocabulary of Mr Belsham, the "person oppressed by the tyranny of evil habits,"[31]) the exact state of his case. "You are deficient in virtuous habits, you wish to form them; you have contracted vicious affections, you wish[32] to exterminate them. You know the circumstances in which your vicious habits were originally contracted, and by which they have been confirmed. Avoid[33] these circumstances, and give the mind a contrary bias. You know what impressions will produce justice, benevolence, &c. Expose your mind repeatedly and perseveringly to the influence of these impressions, and the affections themselves will gradually rise, and insensibly improve, &c. *All* that is required is judgment, resolution, time, and perseverance!"[34] Really, Mr Belsham must excuse me, if I take the liberty of saying, that I know nothing in the English language to equal this, except the Energies of Miss Bridgetina Botherim.[35] It is not my intention to introduce ludicrous ideas upon such a subject; but the resemblance is too striking and apposite to be overlooked.

So far as Mr Belsham's language is intelligible, his process of conversion amounts to this:—He tells the vicious person that he has contracted bad habits; and he desires him by all means to get rid of them. How far this salutary advice and direction would operate to the reformation of the sinner, they, who may have been reclaimed from vicious courses by such means, can best say. But one thing deserves particularly to be remarked, that, whilst the mind of the sinner is directed to contemplate the excellence of virtue, to excite its own energies, to expose itself to impressions, and the like, not one word escapes of the propriety of prayer; on the contrary, all supplication for divine assistance seems to be expressly excluded, and, indeed, evidently must be so, on Mr Belsham's principles. For, if goodness be the necessary result of impressions and circumstances, the mechanical effect of particular traces on the brain, derived from the general operation of established and unalterable laws of our constitution, there is no room, in the particular case, for divine interference. We may, according to Mr Belsham's principles, indulge in sentiments of complacency to that first cause, the beneficial effects of whose original arrangement we feel in the individual instance; but prayer addressed to the Divine Being can have no rational object. Prayer, accordingly, forms no part of this writer's system. In no one line of his work does he recognize it as a Christian duty; indeed, the mention of it has not once escaped him.

---

[30] P. 174.

[31] P. 172.

[32] N. B.—It is above all things necessary for the reformation of this person "oppressed by the tyranny of evil habits," (so alarming and fanatical a phrase as that of *sinner* I must not use,) that he feel no remorse, be the vicious acts that he has committed ever so enormous. For Mr Belsham informs us, in his *Elements*, (pp. 307—406,) that "the doctrine of philosophical necessity supersedes remorse." And, indeed, it is happy that it does so; because, whilst, on the one hand, he pronounces remorse not to be essential to repentance; he proves, on the other, that it is a thing in itself highly pernicious; inasmuch as it is "founded upon the belief, that in the same previous circumstances, it was possible to have acted otherwise." A perfect freedom from uneasiness of mind after the murder of a parent, or the seduction of the innocent; an undisturbed composure, flowing from the conviction, that under all the circumstances it was impossible to have acted otherwise, must surely contribute much to accelerate the repentance of the offender, and to complete his reformation!

[33] This is a whimsical sort of address from a writer who, upon his principle of *necessity*, maintains the impossibility of avoiding, upon the recurrence of similar circumstances, any act which has once been performed. For if this be, as he contends it is, (*Elements*, &c. p. 107,) a sufficient reason for asserting, that the person who has once yielded to any temptation, *must*, under the like circumstances, yield to it again, and that, consequently, the only chance for his escape is to be found in flight; it must likewise be a sufficient reason for concluding, that he who has not at one time been able to fly from the circumstances which brought the temptation, will not be able to fly from them at another; the circumstances, at the time of the intended flight, being the same as before: and thus the impossibility recurs *ad infinitum*. Our writer had condemned Mr Godwin, (*Elements*, &c. p. 405,) for the indiscreet avowal of the consequences of this system; namely, that necessary agents are incapable of moral discipline. But has not Mr Belsham himself as completely disclosed the secret by his reasoning? For, if a *necessary agent* can never acquire an increase of strength to resist the temptations of vice, where is the improvement in moral discipline? This Parthian moralist, who is to be for ever unequal to the *ϛαδία ὑσμίνη*, and can hope to conquer only by flying, will find that he will not have much to boast of in the way of conquest, if his steed is to be as much fettered in the flight as he is himself manacled in the conflict. Alas! that Mr Belsham will not permit his penitent to call to his aid that auxiliary, and that armour, which would enable him to "quench all the fiery darts of the wicked!"

[34] Pp. 174, 175.

[35] *Modern Philosophers*:—a work which, if perused with feelings favourable to religion and order, must be allowed to furnish a decisive proof that Mrs Hannah More is not the only female of the present day, by whom zeal and talents have been eminently displayed, in defence of all that can be deemed valuable in this life, and in that which is to come.

Were we, in truth, to search out among the authors of later times, for those who have most successfully promoted the cause of virtue and religion, by the combination of what is most interesting with what is most edifying in their writings, we should find them to have been principally of the other sex. With the name of Mrs Hannah More, who ranks eminent in that class,—and whose numerous and diversified publications, scattering their benefits through every gradation of society, from the prince down to the peasant, have come home to the breasts of all, with that irresistible force which springs from the united powers of piety and genius,—we have to connect, in grateful remembrance, the names of Hamilton, of Bowdler, of West, of Chapone, and (notwithstanding something that one could wish to be otherwise) of Barbauld. To "the venerable Elizabeth Carter, and the blooming Elizabeth Smith," we have also to cast our eyes; if, in Mrs More's words, we would "contemplate profound and various learning, chastised by true Christian humility;" and if we would wish to dwell on the recollection of "acquirements which would have been distinguished in a university, meekly softened, and beautifully shaded by the gentle exertion of every domestic virtue, the unaffected exercise of every feminine employment," (*Cœlebs*, pp. 250, 251.) Did my present subject lead me merely to advert to the distinction which superior talents, exquisite taste, and the charms of fine composition, confer upon the female writers of the present day, it would be impossible to overlook the commanding claims of Miss Edgeworth.

It is not, then, surprising, that we should find Mr Belsham endeavouring to diminish the opportunities and inducements to prayer by contending, that the Christian religion has not prescribed the appointment of a day for the purposes of divine worship. But he goes farther. He affirms, that "Christianity expressly abolishes every such distinction of days;"[36] that, "under the Christian dispensation, every day is alike; no one more holy than another: that whatever employment or amusement is lawful or expedient upon any one day of the week, is equally lawful and expedient on any other day:"[37] that, consequently, "a virtuous man is performing his duty to the Supreme Being as really, and as acceptably, when he is pursuing the proper business of life, or even when enjoying its innocent and decent amusements, as when he is offering direct addresses to him in the closet or in the temple."[38] From these premises he peremptorily concludes, that all distinctions of days should be exploded: that our business, and our amusements, should be pursued on every day alike: and that the laws which enjoin the observance of the Sabbath are "unreasonable and unjust."[39] He likewise maintains, that the Sabbatical spirit naturally leads to uncharitable and censorious feelings;[40] that "persons who are so very religious on a Sunday," (as to make regular attendance on the services of the church a matter of conscience,) "are too apt to lay aside religion for the rest of the week;"[41] and that, upon the whole, the Sabbatical observance is highly injurious to the cause of virtue. To this pernicious institution our author does not scruple to attribute the decrease of national morality: and he rejoices, with a *Christian joy*, that the late "ill advised" proposition, "for enforcing a stricter observation of the Lord's day," was wisely rejected by the legislature.[42]

Now, it may perhaps occur to a plain, unphilosophical reader to inquire, what sort of a teacher of Christianity is this, who thus levels Christ, through the whole of his existence, to the rank of human nature; leaves man, for acceptance, to his own merit; and that merit the pure result of external impressions, and mechanical operation; rejects the notion of prayer,[43] making man as it were independent

---

[36] *Review*, p. 20. [37] Pp. 20, 139.
[38] P. 133. [39] Pp. 140, 141. [40] P. 141.
[41] P. 142. [42] P. 203.

[43] How different are the reflections of true philosophy, guided by a pious reverence for the superior lights of Revelation! The words of a distinguished and attractive writer, whose publications have always tended to promote what his life has uniformly exemplified, the love and practice of virtue, are too interesting and important to be omitted on this subject. "If we admit the truth of Revelation, the evidence which it delivers of the special interposition of God, in the physical and moral government of the world, must be deemed decisive. Instead, therefore, of involving ourselves in the mazes of metaphysical subtlety, let us direct our attention to the foundation of that intercourse with the Deity, which is at once the most interesting duty, and the noblest privilege of our nature. We are taught, that 'he who cometh to God, must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them who diligently seek him:' that 'in him we live, and move, and have our being:' that 'as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him:' that 'if we, being evil, know how to give good gifts to our children, how much more shall our Father, which is in heaven, give good things to them that ask him.' 'For this thing,' says St Paul, 'I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me.' And our Saviour is recorded to have prayed the 'third time, saying the same words, O! my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: Nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.' Indeed, the form of devotion which Christ recommended to his disciples, affords the clearest proof that he regarded prayer as an acceptable and efficacious act. Nor is this supposition inconsistent with that immutability of the divine attributes, which is essential to their nature and perfection. The wisdom, benevolence, and justness of the Deity, are 'the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.' But this unchangeableness implies, that in their exercise they are always accommodated to the purest rectitude, and to the greatest sum of felicity. And thus a providence is established, which discriminates between the virtuous and the vicious; which adapts the properest means to the accomplishment of the best ends; and regulates all things so as to work together for the highest good. To this superintending direction, a pious Christian will look up with humble confidence, 'for ease under suffering, for protection in danger, and consolation in sorrow.' If prayer were not enjoined as a duty, he would instinctively perform it as a refuge for human infirmity. And he may reasonably presume, that such filial dependence will be indulgently accepted by his heavenly Father, who, in his divine administration, is characterized as being ever ready 'to bind up the broken in heart; to heal the wounded in spirit; and to give good gifts to them that worthily ask him.'"—*Father's Instructions*, part the third, by Thomas Percival, M.D. pp. 118—120. I the more willingly refer to this excellent performance, because, independent of the value of the passage here extracted, and the vein of fervent piety which pervades the entire volume, the observations which it contains on the subject of the Divine permission of evil, the topics it suggests for the farther confirmation of the evidences of Christianity, and the directions it conveys for the due regulation of the clerical conduct and character, entitle it to the most serious perusal from every friend to religion and virtue.

Since the date of the first edition of this work, the revered person spoken of in the above note, has paid the last debt of nature: and has gone to receive, in another state, the reward of the piety and virtues which distinguished him in this. To offer any general remarks here upon the life and character of a man so estimable and so esteemed, would be little worthy of a subject whose magnitude and interest entitle it to the most ample consideration. To the memory of this venerated friend, I have already elsewhere offered an humble tribute. And, happily, as preserving to society a valuable light, a complete memoir of his life and writings has been given to the public by his son, Dr Edward Percival, now of Dublin. This memoir, prefixed to the entire collection of Dr Percival's works, must be too well known, and too justly appreciated, to render it necessary for me to enlarge upon the fidelity and ability with which it has been executed. The spirit which it breathes, and the talent which it exhibits, conspire to afford the happiest presage, of his Maker; and, finally, proscribes the Sabbath, as *destructive of Religion and Morality?* Mr Belsham, being aware that such a question would naturally suggest itself, has been careful to supply the answer. He tells us, that he desires to be considered, as a "Moral teacher of Christianity."[44] And, lest we might not perfectly understand the nature of this *Moral* or *Unitarian* Christianity which he teaches, he informs us, that it is *substantially* the same with the system of Lepaux, and the Theophilanthropes of France. This is a fair and candid account of the matter. The same title, which they can produce to the denomination of Christians, Mr Belsham can undoubtedly advance. Indeed, his must be allowed to be yet stronger: for, though, as he observes, their "common principle is a belief in the existence, perfection, and providence of God, and in the doctrine of a future life; and their rules of morals, love to God, and good will to men;" and thus, as he remarks, their "professed principles *comprehend the essence of the Christian religion;* yet, in not admitting the resurrection of Christ, the Theophilanthropists deprive themselves of the only solid ground on which to build the hope of a future existence."[45] Thus, we see, in one short view, the nature of Mr Belsham's Unitarian scheme, and its advantage over that of the French Theophilanthropes. He not only holds, in common with them, the above mentioned *essential principles of Christianity;* but he also maintains, in addition, that a *man* has actually risen from the dead: the admission of which *fact* into the creed of the Theophilanthropes, he candidly confesses, would have left his scheme no superiority over theirs; inasmuch as, by laying a solid ground for their doctrine of a future life, it would have rendered their system perfectly complete.

But, seriously, are these the doctrines of that sect, who call themselves *Unitarians*, in the sister country? or are they erroneously ascribed to them by Mr Belsham? Indeed, if we are to judge from the applause bestowed on Mr Belsham's performance by writers of that denomination in England, we have reason to think that he has given a fair representation. Now, if he has, it surely seems unworthy of men, who exult in the open and fearless avowal of their opinions, to trifle with the name of *Christian;* and if he has not, it is full time, that they should throw back Mr Belsham's doctrines on himself, and his Theophilanthrope associates. I am most willing to admit, that no person has a right to deny to Mr Belsham the appellation of a "Moral teacher." To this he is fully entitled, as having a firm belief in the existence and general providence of God; and as inculcating principles, that tend to beget love and gratitude to that Being, and to produce a corresponding benignity of affection to our fellow-creatures, impressing the duties of benevolence and social kindness to man, as, I make not the smallest question, he truly feels them. But, whilst thus much is freely admitted, surely Mr Belsham cannot reasonably be offended if he should be denied the appellation of a "teacher of Christianity?" For what is Christianity? Is it any thing differing from the natural religion of the Deist? And if differing; is it in doctrines, or in precepts? Not in doctrines, according to Mr Belsham; for he asserts, again and again, that it has none *peculiar*. Is it in precepts? No, says Mr Belsham; for the pure and simple scheme of the Theophilanthrope, who rejects revelation, "comprehends the *essence* of Christianity." And has, then, Jesus Christ passed as a mute across the great stage of human affairs? And shall we denominate ourselves from Him who has taught us nothing different from what we knew before? No, says Mr Belsham, this is not so: by his rising from the dead, he has *proved to us the certainty of a future life.* Is this then Christianity? Of this, Mr Belsham may be an excellent teacher: but in such Christianity, his instructions will, I trust, ever be confined to a very small number indeed.

And is Mr Belsham displeased with Mr Wilberforce, for calling this "a sort of half-way-house between orthodoxy and infidelity?" I cannot but think, that most people of plain sense and candid minds, who have not been visited by any rays of modern illumination, will rather be of opinion, that Mr Wilberforce, has erred, in not advancing this mansion a little beyond the middle point. Nor is this without countenance from Mr Belsham himself, since he confesses, that "of the two he would rather approach the confines of cold and cheerless scepticism, than the burning zone of merciless orthodoxy;"[46] by which last, it must be observed, he understands the principles of Christianity, as held by the Established Church; *merciless* being merely the ordinary adjunct to the character of every established priesthood.

On this subject, Mr Belsham exhibits rather an unfortunate specimen of that calm and softened charity, which distinguishes and adorns the temperate region, where he rejoices to find himself placed, in a happy medium between the two above mentioned "ineligible extremes." A want of integrity, a disregard of truth, "indolence, pride, and bitter zeal against all who oppose the doctrines of the public creed," he represents as the never failing consequences of an established religion,

---

that the son will prove himself, through life, not unworthy of the father, whose endowments, whose attainments, and whose excellencies, he has recorded.

[44] P. 227.

[45] P. 217.

[46] P. 263.

"whether true or false;" the unvarying characteristics of "an established priesthood." Such a body, he contends, "is, in its very nature, a persecuting order." "All breathe the same fiery and intemperate spirit. Truth and honest inquiry they are paid to discountenance and repress."[47] "Interested priests and crafty statesmen will continue to support a religious establishment, which answers their private and political purposes, at the same time that they hold its doctrines in contempt."[48] The object, to which these observations are intended more immediately to apply, Mr Belsham does not leave his reader at a loss to discover, when he plainly affirms, that the heads of *our* Establishment look to means very different from that of "a sincere faith in" their own "creeds and homilies, for the prosperity of the National Church:"[49] and with the same liberal reference it is, that he reminds us of the saying of Cicero, "that he wondered how augur could meet augur without laughing:" and again of that memorable exclamation of Leo, in the days of papal Rome, "How lucrative is this fable of Jesus Christ!"[50] thus clearly intimating, what a warm supporter of his doctrines and his performance has since announced in terms a little more direct, "It is well known, that many of our public teachers laugh in their sleeves, and some of these sleeves, they say, are of *lawn*, at those doctrines, which they inculcate from the pulpit, with a pretended earnestness."[51]

Nor does Mr Belsham confine his charges to those who are the immediate superintendents of the national religion. Though particularly favoured with Mr Belsham's notice, they do not entirely engross it. By his observations on the institution of a national fast,[52] he takes care to hold up the civil, no less than the ecclesiastical heads of the state, as objects of public contempt and execration, for their gross insincerity, and unprincipled imposition on the people. Now, if all this be of the nature of that charity, which belongs to the middle region, under whose temperate influence Mr Belsham professes to enjoy philosophic repose, I rather apprehend that the inhabitant of this "pleasant and commodious dwelling" is as far removed from the *charity*, as he boasts to be from the *peculiar doctrines*, of *Christianity*.

It must, indeed, be confessed, that great allowance is to be made for those who have been, as it were, rocked in the very cradle of discontent; and who have been used, from infancy, to view every act of the government, and every ordinance of the church, with the bitterness of a discomfited and vindictive enemy. But it is strange, that whilst language of the nature here cited every where deforms Mr Belsham's pages, and those of his Unitarian associates, they should make the *want of charity* the principal charge against all who hold Christianity in any other than the vague and fleeting form in which they profess to embrace it. In the management of a controversy, it may not indeed be bad policy to charge the adversary with whatever unfair arts you mean to resort to yourself. Thus, whilst the opposite party bears all the odium, you possess yourself of the profit. So, at least, it seems to be with the writers of Mr Belsham's way of thinking. A total want of candour and charity is perpetually objected to all who defend the rectitude of the national religion; whilst every principle of both is grossly violated by those who oppose it: and at the same time that the charge of self-interest is freely bestowed upon such as support the Establishment, it is hoped that it will not be remembered that interest is as much concerned to acquire, as to retain; it is modestly expected that no mention will be made of the pride and fervour of party; and that no note will be taken of the resentful jealousy of those temporal advantages, which, as they form the leading theme of animadversion, may not unreasonably be presumed to be the principal ground of hostility.

In a spirit congenial to these feelings, Mr Belsham seems not a little to have participated, when he thus openly states, as in another place[53] he indirectly insinuates, under the thin covering of the terms Paganism and Popery, that the religion of the Church of England is a mere engine of state; and, as such, "cried up by interested statesmen and their hireling priests;" who, he says again, naturally "support that religion which supports them:"[54] and that, at this moment, "*pure Christianity*" (by which he describes the system taught by himself and Dr Priestley) "is so far from meeting with public encouragement in England, that it is in a state bordering upon persecution."[55] This last remark, indeed, seems, according to Mr Belsham's view of things, to have been altogether unnecessary. The assertion, that "an established priesthood is in its very nature a persecuting order," renders this a tautologous position. But, in what way do these professors of *pure Christianity* appear to be "in a state bordering upon persecution?" Simply, because they are not permitted to rail against established authority with impunity; to preach up doctrines in *politics*, subversive of subordination; to bring the government, both in Church and State, into disrepute and contempt amongst the people, by every species of calumny; to establish the enlightened system of France, the Theophilanthropism of

---

[47] P. 199. [48] Pp. 230, 233. [49] P. 220. [50] P. 230.

[51] *Layman's Letters to Mr Wilberforce on the Doctrine of Hereditary Depravity*, p. 172.

[52] *Review*, pp. 204, 205.

[53] P. 196. [54] P. 233. [55] P. 197.

Lepaux, and the miso-monarchism of Paine. The government, the clergy, and the people of England, are surely much to blame for throwing any obstacles in the way of such great reforms!

And what is the grand proof adduced by Mr Belsham, of the persecution carried on against *pure Christianity* in England at the present day? Plainly this, that the great champion of Unitarianism has been driven from his native country, and "compelled to seek for refuge," from the rage of persecuting bigotry, "in the transatlantic wilderness;" in which, however, it appears that he is subject to no deprivations; since we are informed in the very next line, that, in this *wilderness*, he has the good fortune to be surrounded by "enlightened sages."[56] But, ludicrous as is this picture of the *wilderness of sages*, here presented by our author, it were unfeeling, and unpardonable, to trifle on such a subject. What Dr Priestley's reasons may have been for exchanging England for America, I shall not presume to pronounce. That they are not to be resolved "*solely*" into his *religious* opinions, as Mr Belsham seems desirous to convey, is, I believe, pretty generally understood. That the purity of Dr Priestley's private character, the amiable simplicity of his manners, the variety and strength of his talents, the persevering industry with which he pursued what he deemed useful truth, and the independent spirit with which (had it not been frenzied by the intemperance of party) he might have so profitably maintained it,—are circumstances which must make every good man regret that misapplication of his powers, which rendered it necessary for him to abandon his native country in the decline of life, I will most readily admit; and I freely subscribe to the strongest testimony which his warmest admirers can bear to the many and great virtues[57] which adorn his private life. But, whilst I most cheerfully make these concessions to the talents and the virtues of Dr Priestley, and whilst I join in the most decided reprobation of those savage acts of violence, which, in his instance, have disgraced the annals of English polity, yet I cannot hesitate to believe, that if in any country in which the direction of affairs was held by those enlightened politicians, and professors of *pure Christianity*, who form the associates of Dr Priestley and Mr Belsham, any man had employed himself, for a series of years, in labouring to overturn the established order of things, and had even advanced so far as, in the intoxication of his fancied success, openly to boast that he had prepared a train whereby the whole must inevitably be destroyed,[58] a very different lot from that which has fallen to Dr Priestley, would await him. The privilege of transferring his residence to another land, unless, indeed, it were to that land from which no traveller returns, would hardly be conceded. Our enlightened philosophers of the present day, adopt, on these occasions, much simpler modes of proceeding; and a peep across the British Channel may readily satisfy us as to the nature of the process, where there is *no* "lucrative fable of Jesus Christ" to be maintained; *no* "established[59] clergy to breathe the fiery spirit of persecution;" and where the rights of civil and religious man are explained and exercised upon the broadest principles of a philosophy, untrammelled, even to Mr Belsham's most sanguine wishes.

---

[56] Pp. 197, 198.

[57] From a friend, of the highest literary distinction and moral worth, who was connected by habits of early and continued intimacy with Dr Priestley, I received, on the first publication of these remarks on that author's character, a letter containing the following observations.

"The character you give of Dr Priestley has reminded me of that drawn by Dr Samuel Parr, in his letter from Irenopolis to the inhabitants of Eleutheropolis. As this pamphlet was a temporary publication during the riots of Birmingham, and you have probably never seen it, I will transcribe the passage to which I refer.—'I confess, with sorrow, that, in too many instances, such modes of defence have been used against this formidable Heresiarch, as would hardly be justifiable in the support of revelation itself, against the arrogance of a Bolingbroke, the buffoonery of a Mandeville, and the levity of a Voltaire. But the cause of orthodoxy requires not such aids. The Church of England approves them not. The spirit of Christianity warrants them not. Let Dr Priestley be confuted where he is mistaken. Let him be exposed where he is superficial. Let him be rebuked where he is censorious. Let him be repressed where he is dogmatical. But let not his attainments be depreciated, because they are numerous almost without a parallel. Let not his talents be ridiculed, because they are superlatively great. Let not his morals be vilified, because they are correct without austerity, and exemplary without ostentation; because they present even to common observers the innocence of a hermit and the simplicity of a patriarch; and because a philosophic eye will at once discover in them, the deep-fixed root of virtuous principle, and the solid trunk of virtuous habit.' This beautiful portrait is, I think, accurate in its lineaments. But there are two features in the character of Dr Priestley, which it does not exhibit, and which to you I will not scruple to communicate. He has a sort of *moral apathy*, which makes him absolutely insensible of the severity of the wounds he inflicts in his polemic discussions. Feeling no enmities in his constitution, he makes no discrimination between friends and foes. And having adopted the language and dipped his pen in the gall of controversy, he suspects not that he excites bitterness of heart, because he is unconscious of it in himself. I could exemplify this observation, by his treatment of Dr Enfield, Dr Brocklesby, Judge Blackstone, and several others whom he really loved or respected. Another striking trait in his character, is an almost total deficiency in discretion, that intellectual faculty, which is, as Pope well expresses it, 'although no science, fairly worth the seven.' A report has prevailed here, that Dr Priestley proposes to return to England. But I find that his latest letters signify his intention of passing the remainder of his life in America, where he is happy in every respect, except the enjoyment of literary society, and possesses a library and philosophical apparatus far superior to those which he had at Birmingham."

This fragment, containing so much that is interesting concerning Dr Priestley, will, I conceive, not be unacceptable to the reader; and although I consider the bright parts of the character to have been too highly emblazoned by Dr Parr, the darker spots to have been too sparingly touched by my much valued correspondent, and some important points to have been entirely overlooked by both, yet I cannot withhold from the memory of a man certainly possessed of many amiable qualities, and some extraordinary endowments, a tribute, to which two persons, eminent for their worth and their attainments, have conceived him to be justly entitled.

[58] "We are, as it were, laying gunpowder, grain by grain, under the old building of error and superstition, which a single spark may hereafter inflame, so as to produce an instantaneous explosion."—*Importance of Free Enquiry*, p. 40. What Dr Priestley means by the *old building of error and superstition*, the context sufficiently explains. On the impossibility of supporting the ecclesiastical constitution, if once a great majority of the people can be made hostile to it; and on "the power of small changes in the political state of things, to overturn the best-compacted establishments," he likewise enlarges with much earnestness and force: ibid, pp. 39, 41, 44. The fittest seasons, and best opportunities, for silently working out the great effects, which he here professes to hold in view, this writer had before communicated to his fellow-labourer, Mr Lindsey, in the dedication of his *History of Corruptions*, pp. 6, 7. "While the attention of men in power is engrossed by the difficulties that

One distinction between the two cases, may, indeed, possibly exist. The professors of an all-perfect philosophy and a rational Christianity, *knowing* theirs to be the cause of virtue, and acting only from a love of truth, are meritorious in removing, by *whatever* means, all impediments to the accomplishment of ends so glorious as those *they* hold in view: whereas, the advocates of received doctrines, and of existing establishments, not even believing what they profess, and being only concerned to defend a lucrative falsehood, are, by the original sin of their cause, criminal in the performance of every act, however natural and necessary, which has a tendency to maintain it. This distinction may, possibly, supply a satisfactory explanation:—but to proceed.

As I cannot entirely agree with Mr Belsham respecting the persecution carried on by the established clergy, against those who, under the title of Unitarians, are, as Mr Belsham affirms, the only professors of a *pure* Christianity; so neither do I agree with him respecting that which he deems a natural consequence of this persecution,—the great increase of this body in numbers and consequence. Possibly, indeed, without making any very valuable concession to Mr Belsham, it might be admitted, that "the number of *rational* Christians," (by which he means *Unitarians*, or the professors of his *moral Christianity*,) "was never so great as at present:"[60]—a position, which, at the same time, but badly accords with the assertion, that the early Christian church was almost exclusively Unitarian. But, that "it is still a progressive cause," can, by no means, be allowed. So that Mr Belsham may safely release his mind from all apprehensions of that which he so sincerely deprecates, "the *support* of civil authority;" from which he seems to dread the only impediment to its triumphant progress.

If, indeed, by "progressive cause," be meant a progression in its course to that which seems its natural termination, Deism; it might, undoubtedly, in that sense be admitted to be progressive. But if thereby be meant a continued increase of numbers, nothing can be more opposite to the real state of the case. For let any candid and reflecting man, even of this very denomination, lay his hand upon his heart, and say what he thinks likely to be the case of the rising generation, educated in the Unitarian principles: let him say, what *has* been the case of those educated in *the straitest principles of the sect*, under the immediate instruction of its greatest luminaries, Dr Priestley and Mr Belsham, at the academy of Hackney. Let Mr Belsham himself say, what has been the progressive nature of the cause in that seminary. Mr Belsham has too great a regard for truth, not to admit that the pupils of the new light had gone beyond their teachers a little too far; that they had somewhat too strongly[61] exemplified the progres-

---

more immediately press upon them, the endeavours of the friends of reformation, in points of doctrine, pass with less notice, and operate without obstruction." Times of public danger and difficulty are thus pointed out, as best suited to lay that train, which was finally to explode with the ruin of the establishment. And, indeed, at an earlier period of life, he had even ventured to promise himself a more rapid accomplishment of the great object of his wishes. Speaking of the Establishment, and those abuses which he ascribes to the principles of the hierarchy, he does not scruple to predict, that in "some general convulsion of the state, some bold hand, secretly impelled by a vengeful Providence, shall sweep down the whole together."—*View of the Principles and Conduct of the Protestant Dissenters*, p. 12.—Passages conveying similar sentiments in the writings of Dr Priestley might be accumulated: but their notoriety renders it unnecessary.

[59] It will be recollected that this was written in the year 1800.

[60] *Review*, p. 198.

[61] Mr Belsham himself, in speaking of this subject, is obliged in a great measure to acknowledge the truth of this charge. "This fact," (he says, alluding to a statement similar to the above made by Mr Carpenter,) "to a certain extent, cannot be denied; and, most surely, it excited unpleasing sensations in many, and not least in the minds of those whose endeavours to form them to usefulness in the Church were thus painfully disappointed." However, immediately after, he seems, in the contrast between the systems pursued at Hackney and in other seminaries where education is conducted on a different principle, to change the tone of lamentation on this head into a note of triumph. "It is an easy thing," he remarks, "for tutors to educate their pupils in the trammels of any religious faith which they may choose. Take away the key of knowledge, and the business is done. You bring them out at once Calvinists, Arians, Papists, Protestants, any thing that you please; and ready to join in the cry against any sect, which, for the season, may be obnoxious to the ruling party. This was not the method pursued at Hackney: they gloried in encouraging freedom of inquiry: nor were they at all apprehensive, that the interests of truth and virtue would suffer by it in the end" (*Letters on Arianism*, p. 40.) Thus, Mr Belsham, on second thoughts, is of opinion, that what was done in Hackney, is a thing to be gloried in: and that in educating those who were designed for the Christian ministry, so as to render them Infidels and Atheists, "the interests of truth and virtue cannot suffer in the end."

But, that we may the better form a right judgment of that which is conceived to constitute the excellence of those dissenting academies, to which such friends of rational inquiry as Mr Belsham and Dr Priestley have been used to look for the real improvement of youth, I here give an extract from Dr Priestley's *Memoirs* relative to this subject. "In my time, the academy sive nature of the system, by reaching at once the goal of *Deism*, and that in some instances, perhaps not a few, the race had been crowned with the prize of direct, avowed, and unqualified *Atheism*.

Mr Belsham affirms, that "Mr Wilberforce, and others who agree with him, seldom regard their system in a comprehensive view, or pursue their principles to their just and necessary consequences:"[62] and he adds, that "it is from the absurd and injurious consequences which necessarily result from Mr Wilberforce's principles, that he infers their falsehood and impiety."[63] No words can more aptly convey my ideas of Mr Belsham's scheme, than those with which he has here supplied me: for, strange as this gentleman, and those who think with him, may affect to consider the charge, they by no means follow up their principles to their just and necessary consequences; nor, whilst they boast, in a loud and exulting tone, of their dauntless pursuit after truth, have they always the courage to be consistent throughout, and to advance boldly in the face of those conclusions, which, to any intelligent and unprejudiced mind, could not fail to evince "the falsehood and impiety" of the system. But Mr Belsham himself has well remarked, that "the natural and necessary consequences of principles are the same, whether the advocates of such principles are apprized of them or not, and whether they do or do not choose to contemplate and avow them:"[64] and fact completely proves what reason would obviously suggest, that, where the principles of this new sect have been fairly and honestly followed on to their legitimate consequences, the system of Revelation, and, in many cases, of Theism, has been entirely thrown up as a heap of mummery and priestcraft. To cite particular instances were invidious; but they are numerous, and could easily be adduced.

By what has been said, it is, however, far from my intention to charge either Dr Priestley or Mr Belsham, with a disingenuous attempt to escape from such consequences as naturally flow from the opinions which they maintain. No, I believe them both to be incapable of duplicity. But, originally educated, as both confess to have been, in the strictest tenets of that creed whose distinguishing doctrines they now reject, and having, at an early age, entertained a full conviction of the truth and importance of the Christian scheme, some latent influence of their first persuasion naturally remaining, they cannot now release themselves entirely from a Christian belief. Strangely as they have altered and disfigured the structure, the foundation still remains. The first impressions of the youthful mind are not easily effaced. And, fortunately for these gentlemen, something of "what the nurse and priest have taught" still continues, in spite of their boast to the contrary, to retain a secret hold upon their thoughts. To have a fair experiment of the system, we must look to its effects upon those who have never known Christianity but in the Unitarian dress of Mr Belsham and Dr Priestley. Examine these, and behold its genuine fruits.

How, then, can we admit the truth of Mr Belsham's assertion, that the numbers of this sect daily[65] increase? In one way, indeed,

---

was in a state peculiarly favourable to the serious pursuit of truth, as the students were about equally divided upon every question of much importance, such as liberty and necessity, the sleep of the soul, and all the articles of theological orthodoxy and heresy; in consequence of which, all these topics were the subjects of continual discussion. Our tutors were of different opinions: Dr Ashworth taking the orthodox side; Mr Clarke, the sub-tutor, that of heresy, though always with the greatest modesty." Here is a view of the true way, in which, under the guidance of the new lights of philosophy and religion, youth is to be led on "inter sylvas Academi quærere verum." The calm and undisturbed retirement of study exchanged for the unceasing wrangling of a debating club. Tutor and sub-tutor, master and pupil, all together by the ears, continually, on the gravest and deepest subjects of theological controversy; and the sublimest truths and most awful mysteries of revelation bandied about amongst boys, as the common and hourly topics of disputation; whilst the parties of combatants on every subject are equally matched, and falsehood and truth, infidelity and religion, maintained by equal numbers. Under such circumstances of education, it has been truly remarked in reference to Dr Priestley, that in the course which, by his own account, he steered in his theological opinions, there is nothing to excite surprise. "A Calvinist at twelve; becoming an Arminian at eighteen; at twenty-one an Arian; at twenty-four a denier of his Saviour, and a disbeliever in the inspiration of the Scriptures. Miserable infatuation! (it is justly added) to set the stripling on a sea, of which he knows neither the soundings nor the shore: and calmly to see him rush to every point of the compass, before he knows the bearings of any!"

But this academy, which was "in a state so peculiarly favourable to the serious pursuit of truth," was distinguished by other circumstances enumerated by Dr Priestley, which were perhaps not less favourable to that end than those which have been already named. "There was no provision for teaching the learned languages. We had even no compositions, or orations, in Latin. Our course of lectures was also defective, in containing no lectures on the Scriptures or on ecclesiastical history; and by the students in general (and Mr Alexander and myself were no exceptions) commentators in general, and ecclesiastical history also, were held in contempt."—(*Memoirs of Dr Priestley*, p. 21.) Thus, all the prejudices of ancient learning, which might have acted as so many clogs upon the youthful genius, were completely removed; and nothing hindered the boy of the academy from fancying himself at once arrived at that goal, which, in the more measured walks of science, the matured student feels many laborious efforts still requisite to attain.

[62] P. 10.

[63] P. 11.

[64] P. 11.

[65] The writer of a judicious paper, in a late periodical publication, makes the following observations on the nature of the Unitarian or Socinian sect, and on the unlikelihood of its extension:—"Socinianism must ever, from its nature, be the most harmless of all heresies, the least contagious of all the varieties of human opinions. It has been called, and how aptly the history of its Hackney Academy, and all its other institutions may prove, the half-way house to infidelity: but it should be remembered, that many who set out on the pilgrim's-progress of inquiry, take up their place of rest there, who, if there were no such inn upon the road, would infallibly proceed to Doubting Castle. It is a system which saves men from utter unbelief more frequently than it tempts them to it; and it never can

but in that way only, can it bear any resemblance to fact. Men who, having rejected the Christian revelation, are yet restrained, by a regard to opinion and decorum, from openly abdicating the Christian name, may find it not inconvenient to rank themselves of a class whose latitude of opinion can occasion but little embarrassment to that freedom for which they contend: and thus Mr Belsham may possibly reckon among the residents of his "mansion," many who are content to sojourn there on account of its commodious neighbourhood to that region which they regard as their true and proper home.

One proof, however, Mr Belsham produces of his assertion, which might not have occurred to many, and which is entitled to a more than ordinary degree of attention; namely, that "there are thousands" of those professing themselves of the Established Church, who think with him, "but are deterred by secular considerations, and the harsh spirit of the times, from avowing their real principles."[66] Indeed, according to the charitable notions entertained by Mr Belsham, in common with Dr Priestley,[67] of the character of those who maintain the national faith, it is not surprising that this should appear, to minds so prepared, with all the circumstances of probability. And, certainly, no argument can be more convenient: from no combination of events can its force suffer any diminution, and from no ingenuity of reply can it ever meet refutation. Though the entire host of those professing the *pure* Christianity of the Unitarian were ostensibly reduced to Dr Priestley and himself, yet, by the application of this argument, aided by a portion of that faith, which, not having been largely expended on other subjects, Mr Belsham might have to bestow in abundance on this and similar occasions, I should not be surprised to find him solacing himself, even then, with the satisfactory persuasion, that the "glorious period" was fast approaching, in which "the Unitarian church" was about to "comprehend, in its ample enclosure, the whole Christianized world:"[68] the prejudices and interests of mankind causing but a temporary and artificial suppression of those sentiments which must necessarily and universally prevail. This argument, then, I must admit to be wholly unanswerable.

Dr Priestley has indeed advanced, that he "never knew a single instance of any person, who was once well grounded in Unitarian principles, becoming an unbeliever."[69] If the becoming an unbeliever be admitted as the proper proof of an antecedent deficiency of confirmation in Unitarian principles, the position is a safe one; but if Dr Priestley means to say that the influence of Unitarian principles is unfavourable to infidelity, it need only be replied, that the fact speaks a language directly the reverse. For it is notorious, and it will require no small degree of hardihood to deny it, that from those who have *professed* Unitarianism in England the largest stock of unbelievers has arisen: nay, more, that their principal academy, the place in which Unitarian principles were inculcated in their greatest purity, and with every advantage of zealous ability in the teacher, and of unbiassed docility in the learner, has borne witness to the efficacy of those principles, by its dissolution, imperiously demanded by the prevalence of infidel opinions. Now, in what way shall we account for this event? Was Unitarianism not properly taught at Hackney? Or, with all its vaunted simplicity, is it a scheme so difficult to conceive, that the learners, not being able to comprehend it rightly,[70] became unbelievers from not having been *firmly*

---

become a popular doctrine. It appeals to the vanity of the half-learned, and the pride of the half-reasoning: but it neither interests the imagination, nor awakens the feelings, nor excites the passions, nor satisfies the wants of the human heart. Hence it must ever be confined to a few scanty congregations, composed wholly of the reading class, and is equally incapable of producing either extensive good or extensive evil." — *Quarterly Review*, vol. iv. p. 485. With this writer I entirely agree in the opinion, that this jejune and cheerless heresy is not likely to be embraced by many: but that, so far as its influence does extend, it will be found productive of great evil, without any countervailing good, is, I think, as evident as that such an effect must follow from a dereliction of all the leading tenets of a Christian's belief: nor, I confess, does it appear to me a matter of much consequence, whether the traveller, of whom the reviewer speaks, proceeds on his entire journey, or stops short at the inn which Unitarianism provides for him on the way.

[66] P. 227.

[67] Mr Belsham's liberal views of the character of the clergy of the Established Church, have been already noticed in this Appendix, pp. 225, 226. Dr Priestley's representations are of a nature equally complimentary. In his *Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 147, he says of the Trinitarians of the present age, that "they are all reducible to two classes, viz. that of those, who, if they were ingenuous, would rank with Socinians, believing that there is no proper divinity in Christ besides that of the Father; or else with Tritheists, holding three equal and distinct Gods." Having thus distributed the whole body of professed Trinitarians between *insincerity* and *ignorance*, he afterwards, in the conclusion of the same work, (vol. ii. p. 471,) narrows his attention to the clerical part of that body, pronouncing their arguments, in defence of the system they support, to be "so palpably weak, that it is *barely possible* they should be in earnest:" by which it is not difficult to discover, to which of the two classes before named the established clergy were, in his opinion, to be consigned.—That Dr Priestley should, indeed, have imagined that many who rejected the doctrines of the Established Church, might yet be found among the ranks of its professed teachers, may well be supposed, when we find that he deliberately advised Mr Lindsey to retain his preferments in the Church, at the same time that he laboured to undermine its creed: an advice, however, which the rector of Catterick was too honest to comply with, although it might not be unpalatable to certain clergymen of the present day; such as Mr Fellowes and Mr Stone.

[68] *Review*, p. 266.

[69] *Theol. Repos.* vol. iv. p. 24.

[70] Indeed, Mr Belsham seems to represent Unitarianism as a matter complicated, and difficult to be understood. For the total rejection of Christianity by some of his Unitarian brethren, he assigns the following reasons: — "They either did not understand their principles; or they were perplexed with difficulties, which, perhaps, patience and attention might have solved; or," &c.—*Review*, p. 265.

grounded? Howsoever it be explained, the fact is incontrovertible, and seems not a little to countenance the idea, that the road to Unitarianism differs from that which leads to infidelity by so slight a distinction, that the traveller not unfrequently mistakes his way. And surely, if, with Mr Wilberforce, we suppose the station of the former to be placed at no great distance from the confines of the latter, it is not surprising that they, who in the morning of life begin their journey from this advanced stage, should be able to finish the entire course with ease; whilst those, who do not reach it till the evening of their days, may have some indisposition to proceed, especially if, from early habits, they had been taught to feel a salutary horror of those regions that lie beyond.

One difficulty, amounting to paradox, which attaches to this entire system, yet remains to be noticed. It might appear, to such as have been used to consider Christianity as something more than natural religion, with a superadded proof of a future state of retribution, that they who hold this to be the sum of the Christian scheme must, at the same time, reject the writings of the New Testament, or at least all those parts that go beyond the mere facts of the life and resurrection of Christ. Mr Belsham, however, informs us in what manner the Unitarians, whilst they retain the title of Christians, by acknowledging the authority of the New Testament, yet contrive to preserve their "simple creed," unaffected by those important truths which it contains. There are two ways in which the word of Revelation and a system of religious belief may be made to square. One is, by conforming our belief to Revelation: the other, by adjusting Revelation to our belief. The latter is that chosen by Mr Belsham and his Unitarian associates; and, accordingly, the New Testament, and the creed of the Unitarian, are, at the same time, without difficulty retained.

Of the mode of adjustment Mr Belsham exhibits a perfect specimen. "Christ," he says, "being described in the New Testament as a man, having appeared as a man, having called himself a man, having had all the accidents of a man; having been born, having lived, eaten, drunk, slept, conversed, rejoiced, wept, suffered, and died, as other men," there is sufficient reason to pronounce him really such; no farther proof can be required: and the *onus probandi*, he contends, lies with them, who "maintain that he was something more than man:" and whatever texts of Scripture can be adduced in support of that opinion, he adds, "the Unitarians pledge themselves to shew, that they are all either interpolated, corrupted, or misunderstood:"[71] in short, they engage to get clearly rid of them in some way or other. Either the passage should have no place in Scripture; or, if it must be admitted, it should appear under some different modification; or, if the present reading must be allowed, it is wrongly interpreted by all but Unitarians; and sometimes even the subject originally misunderstood by the inspired writer himself: until, at length, the Sacred Volume is completely discharged of all that exceeds the convenient and portable creed of the Unitarian. This, it will be allowed, is, in Mr Belsham's own words, "making Scripture with a witness;"[72] and exhibits no mean specimen of my Lord Peter's ingenious device, in extracting the legitimate meaning of his father's will: the *totidem syllabis*, or at all events the *totidem literis*, cannot fail to supply the deficiencies of the *totidem verbis*.[73]

Lest, however, these ingenious modes of eliciting the sense of Scripture should be deemed too bold, Mr Belsham supplies a decisive reason to prove, that the Unitarian alone is duly qualified to form a sound judgment in matters of sacred criticism. To comprehend the true import of Scripture, he informs us, "requires time, labour, patience, and candour."[74] How, then, could it be expected, that any but the aforesaid moral teachers of Christianity should rightly ascertain its meaning? That this laborious, patient, and candid expurgation of Scripture, whereby every passage intimating the divine nature of Christ is completely expunged, or new-modelled so as to speak a different language, should be stigmatized by the harsh representation, of "mangling and altering the translation to the mind" of the Unitarian, as Mr Fuller and Mr Wilberforce have, it seems, very uncivilly described it, only serves to recal to Mr Belsham's "recollection the honest quaker's exclamation, O argument! O argument! the Lord rebuke thee:"[75] the *argument* being, without question, all on the side of the Unitarian, whose modifications of the Gospel, exhibiting it as a mere revival and confirmation of natural religion, cannot fail to approve themselves to all "men of enlightened minds;" whilst the old orthodox fancies, that "the corruption of human nature, the atonement of the Saviour, and the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit," are the prominent doctrines of the Christian Revelation, — are left to the professors of the national faith; interested and unprincipled men, who, not believing the doctrines they uphold, "testify their regard to the Scriptures by empty professions;" or ignorant and blundering bigots, who are led by a slavish and "blind submis-

---

[71] *Review*, pp. 270—272.

[72] *Review*, p. 116. [73] *Tale of a Tub*, sect. ii. [74] *Review*, p. 272.

[75] This animated and delicate species of irony, is, with Mr Belsham, a favourite mode of treating his literary antagonists. Having, in his controversy with Mr Carpenter, established the inconsistency of man's freedom with the divine foreknowledge, on such principles, that, as he modestly affirms, "no proposition in Euclid admits of a more perfect demonstration;" he suddenly recollects himself,— "But all this is metaphysical reasoning; and why should we puzzle ourselves with metaphysical subtilties?" And then in a spirit of humanity, sympathizing most tenderly with his galled and lacerated opponent, he exclaims,—"*O naughty metaphysics!* thus cruelly to impale a *worthy, well-meaning gentleman*, upon the horns of a goring dilemma, and to leave him writhing and smarting there without relief.— I am sorry for my friend's unfortunate situation." (*Lett. on Arian.* p. 47.) And so he goes on grieving for the cruel discomfiture which he had himself caused to *his friend;* but which, it seems, he could not well have avoided, from the uncommon keenness of his argumentative talent, and the piercing potency of his metaphysics.—It should, however, be observed, to the credit of Mr Belsham, that he has not been influenced by any unworthy fear, to withhold from the world the knowledge of the nature and use of those all-subduing weapons, which have never failed to secure to him such easy triumphs in his controversial campaigns. The logic and metaphysics, whereby he has laid many a sturdy combatant low,

---

he has fairly given to the public; and it is now the fault of those with whom he has henceforward to contend, if they do not conceive with the same clearness, and reason with the same precision, as himself.

On the work which exhibits these, and which, dignified with the title of *Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind and of Moral Philosophy*, professes to give, within the compass of one octavo volume, a most complete view of logics, morals, and metaphysics, I have had occasion already to offer some remarks in the preceding notes of this Appendix. Those remarks, however, as they relate, for the most part, to detached topics, rather incidental to the main object of the work than essentially connected with it, scarcely supply an adequate idea of its true value, and of the benefits which must have accrued, in point of strict reasoning and just conceptions, to the students of Hackney, and which are now held out by this publication to the world at large. I shall here adduce a few specimens, which go more immediately to its general excellence, as a treatise of logical and metaphysical instruction. First, in the list of *axioms*, we find the following, which may prove the degree of caution with which our author proceeds. — "Axiom 4. The *agreement* of two ideas with a third, *cannot prove* their *disagreement* with each other," (p. lii.)—By this, such reasoners as are naturally led to conclude, that when two ideas agree with a third, they *must disagree* with each other, are completely guarded against falling into this vulgar error. Again, in the next page, we are apprized of a *term*, so circumstanced, as that it may become a *proposition*; namely, the major term in a syllogism, whose major premiss is a particular affirmative. For, of such a term, he says, "If it be the subject, it is particularly taken *as being a particular proposition*;" and again, "If it be the predicate, it is particularly taken *as being an affirmative proposition*." This will provide against the errors of those who might have conceived that the term would still remain a *term*, and could never have turned into a *proposition* of any sort. Again, in the matter of *definition*, we find much more of copiousness and versatility, than can be met with in ordinary treatises of logics and metaphysics. The definitions with which the work commences, are those of *perception* and *sensation*. These, and their concomitants, we find thus variously propounded: —

1. "*Perception* is the attention which the mind pays to a variety of impressions made upon it by external objects, or by internal feelings."
2. "*Perception* is the faculty by which we acquire sensations and ideas."
3. "*Sensation* is the perception of an object by the organs of sense."
4. "*Sensation* is the faculty of acquiring certain internal feelings, by the impression of external objects upon the organs of sense."
5. "*A sensation* is the impression made upon the mind by an object actually present."
6. "*Sensations* are internal feelings, excited by the impressions of external objects upon the organs of sense."— See pp. vii. 10, 11, 15, 16.

Now, not only have we here a rich variety of definitions, but such as, by a due combination of their powers, is found capable of engendering more. Thus, if we combine the second and fifth, we obtain a new definition for *perception*; namely, "the faculty by which we acquire *impressions* made upon the mind," &c.: so that *perception* finally turns out to be its own producer, inasmuch as it seeks after, and acquires those impressions, from which, we are told in the first definition, it derives its existence. Again, if we combine the first and sixth, we obtain a more extensive and detailed view of the nature of *perception*· for since, in the latter, *sensations* are described as a species of "*internal feelings*," it follows, that "*perception* is the attention which the mind pays to a variety of impressions made upon it, 1. by external objects, 2. by *sensations*, 3. by all other internal feelings." And, lastly, since by the fifth definition, "a sensation is an impression made upon the mind," if we join this in friendly union with the two former, we have then contained in the definition of *perception*, "an attention to impressions made upon the mind, by impressions which *are* made upon the mind." I will follow this no farther. I do not pretend to exhaust the combinations and their results: these few, perhaps, may satisfy the reader.

Of our author's uncommon powers in *definition*, I shall only give one instance more: but that one cannot but be deemed sufficient, inasmuch as it will shew the possibility of deciding, in an instant, the most difficult questions in metaphysics. "*Volition* is that state of mind, which is immediately previous to actions which are called voluntary." "*Natural Liberty*, or, as it is more properly called, *Philosophical Liberty*, is the power of doing an action, or its contrary, all the previous circumstances remaining the same." (P. 227.) Now here is the point of free-will at once decided: for *volition* itself being included among the previous circumstances, it is a manifest contradiction in terms, to suppose "the power of doing an action or its contrary, all the previous circumstances remaining the same;" since that supposes the power of acting voluntarily against a volition. After this, surely, Mr Belsham might have spared himself the trouble of the ninety-two pages which follow, as his opponents must have been at once suffocated by the above definitions. But the philosopher was determined to give the absurd advocate for free-will no quarter; and therefore has dealt out argument after argument, blow after blow, until the adversary is no longer able to stand before him. He was not even content, until he brought the evidence of *mathematics* to his aid, to prove, *ex absurdo*, that philosophical liberty totally confounds the distinction between virtue and vice. Thus, "for example, *benevolence without liberty* is no virtue; *malignity without liberty* is no vice. Both are equally in a neutral state. *Add a portion of liberty to both*; benevolence instantly becomes an eminent virtue, and malignity an odious vice. That is, *if to equals you add equals the wholes will be unequal*; than which nothing can be more absurd!" Does the reader doubt that these words are fairly quoted? Let him turn to pp. 258, 259, of the *treatise*, and satisfy himself that there is in the world such a mathematician as the author of the above proof. But I have done with this work. It must by this time be clear, that in *logics*, *metaphysics*, *morals*, and *mathematics*, the students must have been well instructed at Hackney.

Having been led by the subject of this note to the mention of a combination of metaphysical and mathematical reasoning almost too ludicrous for serious observation, I cannot make better amends to the reader for such a demand upon his patience, than by directing his attention to a very small but valuable tract, entitled, *The Doctrine of Philosophical Necessity briefly invalidated*; in which the author, Mr Dawson of Sedbergh, has most happily effected that which has been here so unmeaningly caricatured; having enlisted the accuracy and brevity of mathematics (a science with which he is so well acquainted) in the cause of metaphysics: and having thereby been enabled to plant the standard of *Philosophical Liberty* on a strength, from which the advocates of the opposite doctrine have not found it convenient to attempt to dislodge him. One faint effort indeed was made by a writer in the *Monthly Review* for July, 1781. But this was so easily repelled by the author in a second edition of his tract, that, as far as I can learn, the attempt has not been repeated.

sion to vulgar interpretations."[76] It needs scarcely to be remarked, that among the virtues of the new system, *modesty* seems not to occupy, any more than *charity*, a very distinguished place.

For the fulfilment of the engagement, to overturn every interpretation of Scripture that wars with the simple creed of the Unitarian, Mr Belsham refers us, — for he has not thought proper to undertake the task himself, —to a list of commentators, on whose critical exertions he is willing to rest his cause. Here we find, in addition to some respectable names, and to some from whom his peculiar opinions will not receive much support, the names of "Wakefield, Evanson, Lindsey, and Priestley."[77] These last being the only persons now[78] living, of those whom he has enumerated as the great oracles of Gospel interpretation, to these of course he must principally refer, when he affirms, as we have seen, that "the Unitarians pledge themselves" to get rid of every passage in Scripture that militates against the principles of their system. Now, I do agree with Mr Belsham, that if he had traversed the entire range of all who profess to have a single shred of Christianity hanging to them, he could not have found a phalanx more admirably fitted, by the apparatus of "interpolations, omissions, false readings, mistranslations, and erroneous interpretations,"[79] to empty Scripture of every idea that does not correspond with the pure Christianity of those who call themselves Unitarians. Paine could not well have been added to the list. He most imprudently strikes down all at once, and would brush away the flimsy cobwebs, of both Old and New Testament, at one stroke. But, certainly, more[80] resolute expungers, parers, and diversifiers of Sacred Writ, he could not have discovered in the whole tribe of polemics. Of their powers in this way some few specimens have been exhibited in the foregoing *Dissertations ;* and from the notable exertions of master-criticism, which have been there occasionally noticed, little doubt can be entertained of the sufficiency of these writers to fulfil the engagement entered into on their behalf by Mr Belsham.

Our author himself, indeed, has favoured us with but few displays of his critical ingenuity. Those few, however, prove him by no means unworthy of the cause which he supports. The two passages, which expressly ascribe the office of *intercession* to Christ, are, (Rom. viii. 34,) "He is now at the right hand of God, making intercession for us ;" and, (Heb. vii. 25,) "He ever liveth to make intercession for us." Now, as Mr Belsham cannot allow to Christ the office of intercessor, he begins with remarking, that "the exact import of the phrase is difficult to be ascertained" in these passages: and for this he assigns a reason, which cannot be denied to be sufficient, that "probably the writers themselves annexed to it no very distinct idea."[81] Saint Paul, it is clear, was no rational Christian, or he would not have used words so inaccurately and unphilosophically; for, besides the aforesaid vagueness of expression, it is certain, that "God has no right hand at which Jesus can stand, to intercede!"[82] By this philosophical discovery, the authority of Saint Paul is completely and at once set aside. His words, it is shewn, admit no precise meaning. That, however, which Saint Paul ought to have said, Mr Belsham informs us: viz. "that Jesus, having been advanced to great dignity and felicity, is, by the appointment of God, continually employing his renovated and improved powers, in some unknown way, for the benefit of his church." We are told, that "we may imagine what we please, but that more than this is not revealed;" of which it unfortunately happens, that not one word is revealed—except by Mr Belsham; Saint Paul having simply said, that Christ "is now at the right hand of God, making intercession for us." God, however, has *no right hand;* and *interceding* does not mean *interceding.*[83]

---

[76] For these two descriptions of character, and for that of the Unitarians, placed in direct opposition to both, as the only "enlightened and consistent Christians," the reader may turn to what Mr Belsham has said, *Review*, pp. 26—30, 196, 199, 220, 230, 233. Indeed it should be stated in justice to Mr Belsham, that the charges of incompetency, insincerity, and slavish adherence to popular systems, are not confined by him to the divines of the Established Church. Some not a little distinguished amongst the Dissenters, are examples of the impartiality of his strictures. Even the pious, candid, and learned Doddridge had adopted an "erroneous and unscriptural system." "His love of popularity," with other causes, had "strangely warped his judgment in the interpretation of the Scriptures;" and his works are, consequently, "not calculated to instruct his readers in the true sense of the Christian Scriptures, nor to infuse into them a spirit of rational and manly piety." (Pp. 102, 103, 213, 214.) He had unfortunately retained some of those old-fashioned notions about *atonement* and *grace*, which have been vulgarly supposed to distinguish Christianity from natural religion. He was not, in short, a *Rational Dissenter :* for it is not from the members of the Establishment solely, but from the various other classes of dissenters, that the grand characteristic of *Rationality* divides the Unitarian.

[77] *Review*, p. 206.

[78] It is matter of melancholy reflection, that, of the above named writers, all actively engaged in the propagation of their respective opinions when the first edition of this work was published, not one is at this day living. So rapidly do we all pass off in this fleeting scene of things! Respecting those who no longer live to answer for themselves, I confess I feel somewhat of the force of the maxim, *De mortuis nil nisi bonum.* And yet, when it is considered, that though the man dies, the author lives ; that the interests of the living should not be sacrificed to a sentiment unprofitable to the dead ; that, on the contrary, were the deceased himself to rise from the grave, he would probably feel it his first duty to oppose those very errors which he had before been industrious to disseminate ; there seems no good reason, why any greater delicacy should now be used in treating of the pernicious mistakes and misconceptions of such writers, than had formerly been observed ; more particularly as the subject is infinitely too important for compromise. I have, therefore, neither retracted nor softened any observation applying to the works of the above named authors, unless where I have had cause to doubt the truth and justice of the observation itself.

[79] *Review*, p. 206.

[80] Dr Geddes has travelled too slowly through the Old Testament, to entitle him by his meritorious services in the New, to a place in the present list. But from the liberal views which the part of his translation already published, joined to his late volume of *Critical Remarks*, presents, concerning the false representations of the Deity in the *Pentateuch*,—the cruel and sanguinary character of the God of the Hebrews,—the juggle of the miracles said to be wrought by Moses, — the incredible number of prodigies not literally to be believed, — the frequent interposition of the Deity and his agents, not to be admitted, — the absurdity of attributing inspiration to the writers of the early books of the Old Testament, — the error, inconsistence, and downright absurdity, to be found in the Hebrew writings, from which their inspiration cannot be credited, even on the authority of St Paul, or though an angel from heaven were to teach it, — the information of the Hebrew historians derived from public registers, popular traditions, and old songs, — from these, and other observations of a similar nature, there is offered a reasonable promise, that when this translator of the *books accounted sacred* shall have extended his researches to the New Testament, and thereby clearly made known his scheme of Christianity, he will prove himself fully entitled to have his name enrolled among the most enlightened of Mr Belsham's Unitarian commentators. When we find him thus freely concurring with Lord Bolingbroke, in pronouncing the God of Moses to be "partial, unjust, and cruel, delighting in blood, commanding assassinations, massacres, and even exterminations of people," can we doubt that he will agree with his lordship, and other philosophic inquirers, in viewing the God of Paul in a light equally unworthy of our religious adoration ? — Bolingbroke's *Works*, vol. v. p. 567. — 4to. 1754.

The earthly career of Dr Geddes has been closed since the above was written ; nor did he live long enough to carry his mischievous perversions of Scripture beyond the limit of the *Pentateuch* and the historical books.

With a few other criticisms of the like nature Mr Belsham has enriched his work. He has, however, not adventured far into the field of controversy. He has trusted rather to abstract reasoning, upon what he calls philosophical principles, and whilst he has confined himself to the stringing together of a number of rapid conclusions from plausible premises, or to what is vulgarly styled[84] declamation, he has left it to the more critical advocates of Unitarianism to prove, that the words of Scripture bear that meaning which he every where assumes. Indeed, this work, the professed object of which is to try the doctrines of the Gospel by the standard of Scripture, no less than by that of reason, is so miserably deficient in the point of critical inquiry, that its avowed admirers, the Analytical Reviewers, feel it necessary to admit, whilst they endeavour to vindicate, this defect. "We have said this is a popular work. The reader must not look into it for verbal criticism, or the citation of ancient authority." But they add, in excuse, "the work to which it is a reply was altogether declamation."[85] And if so, it has undoubtedly been answered in its own way.

---

[81] *Review*, pp. 69, 70.

[82] *Ibid*, p. 70.

[83] Mr Belsham's remark on the force of the original word, rendered by us, *making intercession*, deserves to be noticed. "The word," he says, "expresses any interference of one person *for* or *against* another." Now, from this it follows, that if Christ be not supposed to interfere *for us*, he must be employed in exercising his power *against us*. Does Mr Belsham prefer this to the received sense? It appears, however, that he has borrowed his view of this passage from Dr Taylor's note on Rom. viii. 27, as he refers us to that for full satisfaction. Such then is the joint light of Dr Taylor and Mr Belsham. But it seems necessary to remind Mr Belsham of the difference between ἐντυγχάνειν κάτὰ, and ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπέρ. I must therefore take the liberty of referring him to his Lexicon. Or, if he will look to commentators, perhaps were he to consult Locke and Pierce, two of those very commentators whom he himself has named, but seems to have named only as giving a grace and character to his list, whilst they certainly deserved to have been placed in better company, he would find their interpretation decidedly in favour of that, which no scholar can question to be the sense of the original, *interceding*. As the authority of a German commentator is likely also to have considerable weight with Mr Belsham, I would recommend it to him to attend to Rosenmüller's distinction, (Rom. xi. 2.)—'Εντυγχάνειν ὑπέρ τινος, est negotium alicujus commendare, intercedere pro aliquo; ἐντυγχάνειν κατά τινος, est aliquem accusare:" so says Schleusner likewise (who deserves to be particularly consulted on the word ἐντυγχάνω,) and so say all the Lexicons. Mr Belsham, however, says otherwise. "Time, labour, patience, and candour," have, no doubt, convinced him that they are wrong.

As Mr Belsham has referred to Dr Taylor, for the true and adequate sense of the original word in these passages, it is but fair to state that writer's observations on the force of the term as applied in Rom. viii. 27. "The Spirit of God *makes intercession for the saints*, not by making application to God on their behalf, but by directing and qualifying their supplications in a proper manner, by his agency and influences upon their hearts; which, according to the gospel scheme, is the peculiar work and office of the Holy Spirit." What then? Is Dr Taylor, he who has so "well explained the Jewish phrases in his admirable Key,"—is he, after all, but one of those "popular interpreters," who, in opposition to the "Rational Christian," contend for the idle notion of the existence and influence of the Holy Spirit? And does he, to whom Mr Belsham refers, for a full explanation of the original phrase commonly rendered in the sense of "making intercession for us," expound the words ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ, when applied to the Holy Spirit, as signifying that benevolent interference, whereby our supplications are rendered more acceptable and effectual with our Almighty Father? The same words, it is clear, cannot be instantly purged of this meaning, when they are applied by the same writer, in a few lines after, to the case of our blessed Lord: so that I fear much, that, when Mr Belsham comes to reconsider this matter, he will be obliged to repudiate his boasted auxiliary, Dr Taylor, as little better than orthodox.

What had been thus given, in the former editions of this work, as matter of speculation, has now become matter of fact: Mr Belsham, in his latter views of this subject, has carefully omitted the mention of Dr Taylor. He finds it much safer to place his reliance on Mr Lindsey; an authority which is not likely to fail him in any Unitarian perversion of the sense of Scripture. And, with his assistance, having first explained the word ἐντυγχάνω, as expressing any kind of interference whatever, he arrives at this conclusion, that what is called the "intercession of Christ" implies the "operation and effect of his mission and doctrine in the world."—(*Calm Inquiry*, &c. p. 327.) In like manner the Unitarian Version, to which he refers, and in which probably he but quotes himself. For an admirable exposure of the absurdity of the intepretation thus given by Mr Belsham and his Unitarian Version, I refer the reader to Dr Nares's *Remarks*, p. 140—144. I shall only add, for the purpose of shewing how miserably unfit the Editors of this Version are for the task which they have undertaken, that in their note on this word in Rom. viii. 34, whilst they profess to give the interpretation of it by Schleusner, (an authority to which I had formerly taken the liberty of referring Mr Belsham,) they garble and actually falsify his application of the term; and again, that in their note on the same word in Heb. vii. 26, they repeat the identical error of reference into which Schleusner had fallen, quoting Acts, xxvii. 24, instead of Acts, xxv. 24: and this too, whilst they are engaged in enumerating the precise parts of the New Testament in which the word is to be found, and would have us believe that they have consulted those very passages for its meaning: thus evincing, at the same time, their servile adherence to any authority on which they may choose to rely, and their negligent rashness united with affected research in matters relating to the accuracy of the sacred text.

[84] One of the finest possible specimens of the species of criticism that goes by this name, is to be found in another publication of Mr Belsham's, which I have already noticed, entitled *Letters on Arianism.* At p. 129 of that work, he attacks the absurdity of deducing from the language used throughout the New Testament, respecting the "creation of all things by Jesus Christ," the strange conclusion, that by him a creation was literally effected. He admits, indeed, that in Ephesians, iii. 9, it is said, that "God created all things by Jesus Christ:"—that in Heb. i. 2, it is said, "by whom also he made the worlds;"—and, again, in Colossians, i. 15, 16, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him

I have now done with Mr Belsham; nor should I have directed the attention of the reader so much to this gentleman's performance, had I known any[86] other work than the *Review of Mr Wilberforce's Treatise*, in which the entire system and bearings of the doctrines called Unitarian are exhibited with equal brevity, distinctness, and candour. To

---

all things consist." But after lanching against these, the usual Socinian refutations, — that *creating* does not mean *creating*, and that *worlds* are *dispensations*, &c. &c. — he proceeds, by a still happier flight, to shew that the same language is as applicable to Bonaparte as to Jesus Christ. I give his words: — "Of a certain person, who now makes a very considerable figure in the world, it may be said with truth, so far as the civil state of the continent of Europe is concerned, that he is the creator of all these new distinctions, high and low, whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all these things are made by him, and for him, and he is before them all, takes precedence both in time and dignity, and by him do all these things consist. Yet who would infer from such language as this, that the present ruler of France is a being of superior order to mankind, much less that he is the maker of the wold? The language which is true of Bonaparte, in a civil sense, is applicable to Jesus Christ in a moral view; but it no more implies pre-existence, or proper creative power, in one case than in the other!" — This comment of Mr Belsham's requires no comment from me.

[85] *Review* for March, 1798.

[86] That part of the Unitarian creed which relates to the person and character of our Lord, has received some additional touches from the hand of Mr Belsham, in a work recently published; which he entitles, *A Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ;* and in which he professes to give a formal digest of the recognized opinions of the Unitarians upon this subject in the year 1811. Of this digest I select the few passages which follow. — "The Unitarian doctrine is, that Jesus of Nazareth was a man constituted in all respects like other men, subject to the same infirmities, the same ignorance, prejudices, and frailties,"— "that he was born in low circumstances, having no peculiar advantages of education, or learning," &c. — "The Unitarians maintain, that Jesus and his apostles were supernaturally instructed, as far as was necessary for the execution of their commission, that is, for the revelation and proof of the doctrine of eternal life, and that the favour of God extended to the Gentiles equally with the Jews; and that Jesus, and his apostles, and others of the primitive believers, were occasionally inspired to foretell future events. But they believe that supernatural inspiration was limited to these cases alone: and that when Jesus or his apostles deliver opinions upon subjects unconnected with the object of their mission, such opinions, and their reasonings upon them, are to be received with the same attention and caution with those of other persons in similar circumstances, of similar education, and with similar habits of thinking," (pp. 447, 451.) Here then is an improved view of the case: a manifest progress in the Unitarian system. The supernatural instruction vouchsafed to our Lord was strictly limited to the object of his mission: this object was exclusively to make known the doctrine of eternal life, and the admission of the Gentiles to divine favour equally with the Jews: in all matters not connected with this object, the opinions and reasonings of our Lord are to be esteemed of no greater value than those of any person of similar circumstances and education, he being subject to the same ignorance and prejudices to which the common nature of man is subject: and as he was of low circumstances, and had no peculiar advantages of education or learning, of course it follows, upon the whole, that the opinions and reasonings of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ are (except when they relate to the doctrine of future life and universal retribution) to be treated with as little respect as those of any person of low origin and circumstances, who had received as few advantages of learning or education. I have not carried on the argument as regarding the apostles, for Mr Belsham and his associates have long ago disposed of the Epistles. But how much of the Gospels must now follow them as waste paper? —Yet, farther, it is not merely the "ignorance and prejudices" to which our Lord was "as subject as other men," that we have to guard against, in his opinions and reasonings on all topics, save the one above excepted; but we have also to secure ourselves against the consequences of those "infirmities and frailties" of all descriptions, which are incident to human nature, and to which our Lord was not less liable than other human beings. Thus, according to Mr Belsham, the moral as well as the intellectual imperfections, which render the opinions and reasonings of men, and more particularly of men who have had no peculiar advantages of education or learning, liable to error and exception, alike affect the opinions and reasonings of our blessed Lord; save only that one subject, to which, Mr Belsham informs us, his commission was rigidly restricted. As Mr Belsham's language seems here to cast a reflection on the moral character of our Lord, it is but justice to Mr Belsham to state what he has expressly said upon that point. "The moral character of Christ, through the whole course of his *public ministry*, as recorded by the evangelists, is pure and unimpeachable in every particular. Whether this perfection of character in *public* life, combined with the general declaration of his freedom from sin, establish, or were intended to establish, the fact, that Jesus, through the whole course of his *private* life, was completely exempt from all the errors and failings of human nature, is a question of no great intrinsic moment, and concerning which we have no sufficient data to lead to a satisfactory conclusion," (p. 190.) Here Mr Belsham admits, that we have no actual proof of any sinful acts committed by our Lord in his private life, so that we cannot positively and satisfactorily pronounce any thing upon that head. But it must be observed, that this admission has been made after the recital of certain declarations of Scripture, that "he knew no sin;" that he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;" that he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth;" and others of the same import: — although, as these declarations do not relate to the object of Christ's mission, as stated by Mr Belsham, it is difficult to discover to what credit they are entitled upon the principle which he has laid down. In a distant part of his work, however, in which he was sufficiently removed from the influence of the above testimonies, and when he prepares himself to sum up resolutely the articles of the Unitarian creed, he rises above the weakness into which he had here allowed himself to fall; and (as we have seen above) affirms of that great Being, who came to redeem the world from sin, that he was subject to the common infirmities and frailties of human nature. It will not now appear surprising, that Mr Belsham and his Unitarian associates, are so extremely anxious to establish the apocryphal Gospel of the Nazarenes to be the true original Gospel of St Matthew: for that Gospel, as Jerem. Jones (a favourite with the Unitarians) has shewn, in his *Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament*, vol. i. p. 376, has left us reason to believe, that "Christ was a sinner, or, at least, that it is doubtful whether he was so or not!"

Mr Belsham is certainly due the praise of an honest and open avowal of his sentiments. And in his work, as I doubt not in his life, are exhibited strong traits of talent, combined with amiable and virtuous feeling. The same freedom with which he has treated others, and with which, were he to offer any animadversions on this work,[87] his pen would be directed towards me, I have not scrupled to use with him. If I have misrepresented him, it certainly has not been my intention. His language, I confess, has offended me by its arrogance; and perhaps the feeling which that would naturally excite may have dictated a mode of reply not always sufficiently respectful. If any thing like asperity or sarcasm has escaped me, I wish it to be considered as applied to the cause, and to the manner of supporting it, rather than to the writer himself. His opinions, as undermining the best interests of human kind; and his style, like that of all the writers of the same side of the question, as tending to overbear by an imposing confidence of tone, and a familiar and frontless assumption of superiority, can scarcely be received without indignation,[88] or met without warmth. I do not pretend to have been free from the impression of these feelings. I trust, however, I have not permitted them to carry me beyond the due limits. My object has been truth; and my wish, not unnecessarily to hurt the feelings of Mr Belsham, or of those who, with him, assume the title of Unitarians. If to the body of that denomination at large I have attributed sentiments and opinions which they do not recognize as justly imputable, it is to Mr Belsham, not to me, they are to ascribe the error. My representation of their peculiar tenets has been chiefly derived from the work which he has given to the public, with the express purpose of promulging and vindicating the creed of the Unitarians, or Rational Christians. If he has not been a faithful interpreter of their opinions, it is theirs to correct the mistake. Hitherto that publication has been circulated as the *Unitarian Manual;* and, whatever reception it may have experienced from others, has certainly seemed to obtain among that description of Christians no small portion of applause.

---

[87] Since the first publication of this work in 1801, neither Mr Belsham nor any of his learned Unitarian fellow-labourers, have, as far as I know, favoured the public with any observations upon the arguments which it contains. Dr Priestley, if I recollect rightly, about the year 1790, stated, in one of the public prints, that his *History of Early Opinions* having remained a long time unanswered, if the same silence should be observed during a limited period, which he specified, he would consider it as an acknowledgment, on the part of the whole Christian world, that it was unanswerable. In this I will not presume to follow Dr Priestley's example. It had better become Dr Priestley to suppose, that his work had not received an answer, because it was not deemed of sufficient moment to demand one. It must surely become me to suppose the same of mine. At the same time, I cannot but rejoice that its reception and circulation have been such as to give good reason to believe, that there is no small portion of the community to whom it appears to contain useful matter: and I shall certainly feel most sincere satisfaction, if it be allowed to continue to work its silent way, without the noise and the exasperation of controversy.

[88] I cannot allow myself to employ the term which Mr Belsham does not scruple to combine with this, on much slighter provocation, — "*contempt.*" (*Reveiw*, p. 64.) And yet, — to pass from Mr Belsham to the entire class of his fellow-labourers, and to speak, not of the individual, but of the cause at large, and of its champions, — what can be more fitly calculated to excite even the feeling which that term expresses, than the impotent and arrogant attempts of a few loquacious Socialists, directed against the sublime and solid truths of Revelation? Bishop Watson, whose tolerant moderation is the subject of general praise, is forced to exclaim, that "it cannot but move one's indignation, to see a smattering in philosophy urged as an argument against the veracity of an apostle," (*Two Apologies*, &c. p. 359.) What shall be said, when the same sort of smattering is employed to overturn the whole edifice of Christianity, to subvert the sanctioned wisdom of ages, and to overwhelm, in one shapeless ruin, the joint structure of learning and inspiration? — The Dean of Winchester, who is so justly distinguished for the brilliancy of his talents, the richness of his acquirements, and the eloquence and vigour of his style, has described the modern Socinianism, as "consisting of a train of whimsical paradoxes, the mere abortions of the mind! strange without originality, dull without sobriety, flippant without wit, and contagious without allurement," (*Discourses on various Subjects*, p. 145.) A feature equally appropriate, and more offensive, because more insulting and more mischievous, remains to be added to the picture; namely, an imposing affectation of superior knowledge, without possessing any of its attainments. That grandest of all mischiefs, which an admired ancient has described as 'Αμαθία τις μάλα χαλεπὴ, δοκοῦσα εἶναι μεγίϛη Φρόνησις, eminently belongs to the race of modern Socinians, or Unitarians as they choose to call themselves, and requires of course only to be unmasked in order to be put down. To this, I confess, my efforts (throughout this Appendix especially) have been particularly directed: and so anxious have I been to effect this point, which in such a case I conceive to be vital, that I have not hesitated to expose myself to those imputations which are generally cast upon the liberality and the politeness of the writer, who scruples not to press home truths in a direct manner, without fear, and without compromise. If I have had the good fortune to accomplish this object, I am satisfied to submit to whatever consequences may follow.

I am not, indeed, without the apprehension, that I may appear to assume somewhat too much in the application of the following passage from Bishop Warburton; and yet it approaches so nearly to the state of my own feelings, in winding up this Appendix, that I cannot avoid transcribing it. In speaking of the particular manner in which he had thought it right to treat the pernicious sophistries which were opposed to the fundamental truths of Christianity, that glowing and powerful writer thus expresses himself.—"He knows what the gentle reader thinks of it. But he is not one of those opposers of Infidelity, who can reason without earnestness, and confute without warmth. He leaves it to others, to the soft Divine, and courtly Controversialist, to combat the most flagitious tenets with serenity; or maintain the most awful of religious truths in a way, that misleads the unwary reader into an opinion of their making but little impression on the writer's own heart. For himself, he freely owns, he is apt to kindle as he writes; and would even blush to repel an insult on sense and virtue with less vigour than every honest man is expected to shew in his own cause."—*Remarks on Hume's Essay*, &c. p. 12.

Such observations as have been added to the Appendix, since the appearance of the first edition of this work, it has been thought right to introduce in the form of notes, so as to leave the text (as it originally stood) unaltered

EDINBURGH:
Printed by Andrew Shortrede, George IV. Bridge.

A
PRACTICAL TREATISE
ON
REGENERATION.

BY

JOHN WITHERSPOON, D.D

PRINCIPAL OF PRINCETON COLLEGE, NEW JERSEY.

CONTENTS.

Page
Introduction, ... 1

CHAPTER I.

Some general observations on the metaphor used by the apostle John, "Except a man be born again;" and the same or similar expressions to be found in other parts of the word of God, ... 2

Sect. I.—From this expression, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," we may learn the greatness of that change which must pass upon every child of Adam before he can become an heir of life, 3

Sect. II.—This expression, "Except a man be born again," and other similar expressions, imply, that the change here intended is not merely partial, but universal. 5

Sect. III.—From these words, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," and other similar expressions in the Holy Scriptures, we may infer, that the change here intended is not merely external and imperfect, but inward, essential, and complete, 8

Sect. IV.—From this metaphor, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," and other parallel expressions in the Holy Scriptures, we may learn that the change here intended is supernatural, . 16

CHAPTER II.

In which is shewn wherein this change doth properly and directly consist, and what are its principal evidences and fruits, ... 20

Page
Sect. I.—Wherein the change in Regeneration doth properly and directly consist, . . . 20

Sect. II.—The second part of this change, . . 22

Sect. III.—The effects of Regeneration, with some of the principal evidences of its sincerity, . . 25

Sect. IV.—A more particular inquiry into what properly constitutes the sincerity of the change, . . 30

CHAPTER III.

Of the steps by which this change is accomplished, . 37

Sect. I.—There must be a discovery of the real nature of God, ... 38

Sect. II.—There must be a discovery of the infinite glory of God, ... 42

Sect. III.—There must be a conviction of sin and danger, 44

Sect. IV.—Of the degrees of sorrow for sin in true penitents, ... 48

Sect. V.—Acceptance of salvation through the cross of Christ, ... 52

Sect. VI.—How the believer recovers peace of conscience, 56

Sect. VII.—How the Christian is governed in his daily conversation, ... 58

Conclusion, ... 60

A

PRACTICAL TREATISE

ON

REGENERATION.

Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.—JOHN, iii. 3.

INTRODUCTION.

THE condition on which ministers of the Gospel hold their office, is extremely awful. "They must render an account unto God" of their fidelity to the souls committed to their charge. Their duty and danger, as servants of God, are jointly and strongly expressed in the commission given to the prophet Ezekiel: "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel, therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die! and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at thine hand. Yet, if thou warn the wicked, and he turn not from his wickedness, nor from his wicked way, he shall die in his iniquity: but thou hast delivered thy soul," Ezek. iii. 17—19.

It is natural for us, in such a situation, to be often revolving in our minds this great and weighty trust. It is at once our duty and interest, to consider with all possible care, in what way we may have the easiest and most effectual access to the hearts of sinners; what views of divine truth will be most convincing, what forms of address will make the strongest and most lasting impression; in one word, how we may acquit ourselves in our ministry, so as to be a "savour of life unto life" to many of those who hear us, and to "deliver our own souls" from the blood of those that perish.

Such, indeed, is the undeniable moment and importance of the truths of the Gospel, that I am often ready to think, it will be easy to set them in so clear and convincing a light, as that no person of common understanding shall be able to resist. I am often ready to say within myself, Surely, if they be warned, they will no more dare to rush on the thick bosses of the Almighty's buckler: surely, the boldest sinner must tremble at the thoughts of death, judgment, and eternity, fast approaching, and from which it is impossible to fly. But, when we see how many are able to sit unmoved under the most awful threatenings from the word of God, how many continue unchanged under the most alarming dispensations of Providence, our thoughts are immediately carried to the unsearchable depth of Divine counsels; and we must say with our blessed Saviour, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight," Luke, x. 21.; or with the Apostle Paul, "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them," 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4.

The secret counsel of the Most High, however, though we must adore with reverence, it is impossible for us to comprehend. What influence this has upon the final state of particular persons, no man in the present life is, and probably no created being will ever be, able fully to explain. This only we know, that it is not such as to take away the guilt of sin, or destroy the efficacy of means. A sense of duty therefore constrains us to resume the arduous and difficult task, entreating the assistance and blessing of God, under a firm persuasion that he will hear the prayer of faith, and make his own word "quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and the marrow, and a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

The subject I have made choice of, and intend to handle in the ensuing treatise, immediately regards the substance of religion, and is happily as little entangled in controversy as any that could be named. We are told, that "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." In this, all parties, every profession and denomination of Christians, do or ought to agree. By whatever name you are called, whatsoever leader you profess to follow, whatever ordinances you enjoy, if you are not "born again," you shall not enter into the kingdom of God.

That manner of preaching the Gospel, explaining or recommending divine truth, appears to me most profitable, which brings oftenest into view, or rather never loses view of the great and essential difference between believers and unbelievers, saints and sinners, heirs of glory and heirs of hell. These are mixed together on earth : they have common privileges as men and citizens : they cannot be certainly distinguished by human observation ; for though the image of God shines in a bright and sensible manner in some on the one hand, and some bear very plain and deadly symptoms on the other, whose state may be determined with little hazard of mistake ; yet, in the intermediate degrees, there are multitudes whose real character is known only to God. What then can be said more awakening, and, at the same time, more certainly true, than that every hearer of the Gospel, and every reader of such a treatise as this, is either reconciled to God, and the object of his love, or at enmity with God, having "neither part nor portion" in his favour ; and as many as die in this last condition, shall be the everlasting monuments of Divine wrath. How important a distinction ! and can any man refrain from saying, "Lord, thou knowest all things — to which of these classes do I belong ?"

But there is something, if possible, still more pressing in the passage of Scripture which I have placed at the head of this discourse. Not only are all men of two different and opposite characters now, but all men are originally of one character, unfit for the kingdom of God ; unless a change has passed upon them, they continue so ; and, unless a change do pass upon them hereafter, they must be for ever excluded. This our Lord introduces with a strong asseveration, and signal note of importance : "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." These words were spoken to Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews. This "master in Israel" came to Jesus by night. Convinced he seems to have been of the power which attended his ministry, but, under a still stronger attachment to his worldly interest, he durst not openly avow his conviction. Our Lord, at once to enlighten his mind with the most salutary of all truths, and level his pride of understanding by the manner of conveying it, saith to him, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." This appears to have been extremely astonishing, by his answer in the following verse : "Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old ? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born ?"

It is not my purpose to give a tedious explication of the passage, or to entertain the reader with a profusion of criticism upon the words. This expression, "the kingdom of God," hath various significations in Scripture, but chiefly two in the New Testament ; 1. The gospel dispensation, or government of the Messiah, as distinguished from the preceding periods ; 2. The kingdom of heaven, where the sincere disciples of Christ shall be put in full possession of the blessings of his purchase. I take it to be the last of these that is either only, or chiefly intended in this place. Both of them, indeed, may be meant in their proper order, and for their different purposes. An open profession, and receiving the external badge, was necessary to a concealed friend and cowardly disciple ; but a right to the spiritual privileges of the Gospel, and the promise of eternal life, was the only thing that could make the profession valuable or desirable. Accordingly, our Saviour seems to speak of both in his reply to Nicodemus—admission into the visible Church by baptism, and renovation by the Holy Ghost. "Jesus answered, Verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."

I am sensible that regeneration, or the new birth, is a subject at present very unfashionable ; or, at least, a style of language which hath gone very much into disuse. It is, however, a subject of unspeakable moment, or, rather, it is the one subject in which all others meet as in a centre,—the grand inquiry, in comparison of which, every thing else, how excellent soever, is but specious trifling. What doth it signify, though you have food to eat in plenty, and variety of raiment to put on, if you are not born again ; if, after a few mornings and evenings spent in unthinking mirth, sensuality, and riot, you die in your sins, and lie down in sorrow ? What doth it signify, though you are well accomplished, in every other respect, to act your part in life, if you meet at last with this repulse from the supreme Judge, "Depart from me, I know you not, ye workers of iniquity ?"

If this subject is indeed unfashionable and neglected, we are miserably deceiving ourselves. If a new nature is necessary, to attempt to repair and new-model the old, will be found to be lost labour. If the spring is polluted, and continues so, what a vain and fruitless attempt it is to endeavour, by addition, or by foreign mixture, to purify the streams ! Just so, it is by no means sufficient, or, to speak more properly, it is altogether impossible, to reform the irregularities and vicious lives of sinners, and bring them to a real conformity to the law of God, till their hearts are renewed and changed. It is like rearing up an old fabric, adding to its towers, and painting its walls, while the foundation is gone. See what the prophet Ezekiel says of such foolish builders, "Wo to the foolish prophets—because, even because they have seduced my people, saying, Peace, and there was no peace; and one built up a wall, and, lo, others daubed it with untempered mortar: Say unto them which daub it with untempered mortar, that it shall fall: there shall be an overflowing shower, and ye, O great hailstones, shall fall, and a stormy wind shall rend it," Ezek. xiii. 10, 11.

But, perhaps, the substance of the doctrine is retained while the language is held in derision. We are told, it is but a figurative expression, and the same in its meaning with repentance or reformation. Doubtless it is so. And it were greatly to be wished, that many did thoroughly understand what is implied in repentance unto life. But the reader is entreated to observe, that it is a metaphor frequently used in the Holy Scripture. I think, also, it is a metaphor of peculiar propriety and force; well adapted to bring into view both the nature of the change which it describes, and the means by which it is accomplished. If there are any who, in writing or speaking on this subject, have introduced or invented unscriptural phrases, and gone into unintelligible mysticism, this is neither wonderful in itself, nor ought it to be any injury or disparagement to the truth. There is no subject, either of divine or human learning, on which some have not written weakly, foolishly, or erroneously; but that ought not to excite any aversion to the doctrine itself, which hath been perverted or abused. I pray, that God may enable me to write upon this interesting subject, in a clear, intelligible, and convincing manner; to support the truth from the evidence of Scripture and reason; to resolve, in a satisfying manner, any objections that may seem to lie against it; but, above all, to carry it home with a persuasive force upon the conscience and heart. I contend for no phrases of man's invention, but for such as I find in the Holy Scriptures: from these I am resolved, through the grace of God, never to depart. And, in the meantime, I adopt the words of the eminent and useful Dr Doddridge: "If this doctrine, in one form or another, be generally taught by my brethren in the ministry, I rejoice in it for their own sakes, as well as for that of the people who are under their care."

The plan of the following treatise is this:

I. To make some general observations upon the metaphor used by the Apostle John, "Except a man be born again;" and the same or similar expressions to be found in other parts of the word of God.

II. To shew wherein this change doth properly and directly consist, together with some of its principal evidences and effects.

III. To show by what steps, or by what means, it is usually brought about.

IV. In the last place, to improve the subject by a few practical addresses to persons of different characters.

CHAPTER I.

SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE METAPHOR USED BY THE APOSTLE JOHN, "EXCEPT A MAN BE BORN AGAIN," AND THE SAME OR SIMILAR EXPRESSIONS TO BE FOUND IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORD OF GOD.

It deserves the serious attention of every Christian, that, as this declaration was made by our Saviour in a very solemn manner, and by a very peculiar metaphor, so this is not the single passage in which the same metaphor is used. We find it in the apostle Paul's epistle to Titus, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost," Titus, iii. 5. We find one perfectly similar to it, in the same apostle's second epistle to the Corinthians, "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away, behold, all things are become new," 2 Cor. v. 17. It is elsewhere called a new creation, with reference to the power exerted in the production: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them," Eph. ii. 10. It is still a figure of the same kind that is used, when we are exhorted "to put off, concerning the former conversation, the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts: and to be renewed in the spirit of our mind; and put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," Eph. iv. 22—24. To name no more passages, the real believer is said to be "born of God," 1 John v. 4; in which the very expression in the text is repeated, and the change attributed to God as his proper work.

Whoever believes in the perfection of the Scriptures will readily admit, that it is intended we should learn something from this very way of speaking itself. Let us therefore consider what may be safely deduced from it. And, as I would not willingly strain the metaphor, and draw from it any uncertain conclusion; so it is no part of my design to run it out into an extraordinary length. Many smaller resemblances might easily be formed between the image and the truth, but they would be more fanciful than useful.

The reader is only entreated to attend to a few leading truths, which seem naturally to arise from this metaphor, and may be both supported and illustrated from the whole tenor of Scripture doctrine.

Sect. I.—From this expression, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," we may learn the greatness of that change which must pass upon every child of Adam, before he can become an heir of life.

No stronger expression could have been chosen to signify a great and remarkable change of state and character, whether we take the metaphor in a stricter or a looser sense. If we take the metaphor in a stricter sense, it may be intended to point out the change of state in an infant newly born, from what it was in immediately before the birth. The manner of its existence, of deriving its existence, of deriving its nourishment, the use and application of its faculties, and its desires and enjoyments, are all entirely different. If we take the metaphor in a looser sense, being born may be considered as the beginning of our existence. To this sense we seem to be directed by the other expressions, of being created in Christ Jesus, and made new creatures. Does not this still teach us the greatness of the change? We must be entirely different from what we were before, as one creature differs from another, or as that which begins to be at any time, is not, nor cannot be the same with what did formerly exist.

This may also be well supported from a variety of other passages of Scripture, and is a consequence of different truths contained in the word of God. For example, our natural state is, in Scripture, compared to death, and our recovery to our being restored to life. Thus the Apostle Paul, in writing to the Ephesians, says, "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." And a little after, "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ," Eph. ii. 1, 4, 5. To the same purpose the Apostle John says, "We know that we have passed from death to life," 1 John, iii. 14. The change is sometimes described by passing from darkness to light, than which no two things can stand in greater opposition to one another. "Ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord," Eph. v. 8. Every one must be sensible how easy it would be to multiply passages of the same kind. But this I forbear, and only wish we had all of us a deep impression of the meaning and importance of these upon our hearts.

It will not be improper, however, to observe how plainly the same truth appears, from the power which the Scripture represents as exerted in bringing a sinner from a state of nature to a state of grace. It is constantly affirmed to be the work of God, the effect of his power, nay, the exceeding greatness of his power. "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God," Eph. ii. 8. "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling: for it is God who worketh in you to will and to do of his good pleasure," Phil. ii. 12. "And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead," Eph. i. 19. Now, is there any need of a Divine agent to perform a work of no moment? Would it be celebrated as an effect of the power of God, if it were not truly great?

Let me now, in the most earnest manner, beseech every person who reads these lines, to consider deliberately with himself what is the import of this truth, and how firmly it is established. It appears that regeneration, repentance, conversion, or call it what you will, is a very great change from the state in which every man comes into the world. This appears from our Saviour's assertion, that we must be "born again." It appears from a great variety of other Scripture phrases, and is the certain consequence of some of the most essential doctrines of the gospel.

With what jealousy ought this to fill many, of the state of their souls? How slight and inconsiderable a thing is it that with multitudes passes for religion! especially in these days of serenity and sunshine to the Church, when they are not compelled by danger to weigh the matter with deliberation. A few cold forms, a little outward decency; some faint desires, rather than endeavours, are all they can afford for securing their everlasting happiness. Can the weakness and insufficiency of these things possibly appear in a stronger light than when true religion is considered as a new creation, and a second birth? If the inspired writers be allowed to express themselves either with propriety or truth, it is painful to think of the unhappy deluded state of so great a number of our fellow-sinners.

Will so great a change take place, and yet have no visible effect? Had any great change happened in your worldly circumstances, from riches to poverty, or from poverty to riches, all around you would have speedily discerned it. Had any such change happened in your health, it had been impossible to conceal it. Had it happened in your intellectual accomplishments, from ignorance to knowledge, it would have been quickly celebrated. How comes it then to be quite undiscernible, when it is from sin to holiness? I am sensible that men are very ingenious in justifying their conduct, and very successful in deceiving themselves. They will tell us that religion is a hidden thing, not to be seen by the world, but lying open to His view who judgeth the secrets of all hearts. And doubtless this is, in one view, a great truth: true religion is not given to ostentation; diffident of itself, it is unwilling to promise much, lest it should be found wanting. But it ought to be considered, that however concealed the inward principle may be, the practical effects must of necessity appear. As one table of the moral law consists entirely of our duty to others, whoever is born again, and renewed in the spirit of his mind, will be found quite a different person from what he was before, in his conversation with his fellow-creatures.

Hypocritical pretences to extraordinary sanctity are indeed highly criminal in themselves, and extremely odious in the sight of God. But the present age does not seem to have the least tendency to this extreme. There is another thing, much more common, not less absurd, and infinitely more dangerous to mankind in general: a demand upon the public, that, by an extraordinary effort of charity, they should always suppose the reality of religion in the heart, when there is not the least symptom of it in the life. Nay, some are hardly satisfied even with this, but insist that men should believe well of others, not only without, but against evidence. A bad opinion expressed of a man, even upon the most open instances of profanity, is often answered with, "What have you to do to judge the heart?" It is amazing to think what inward consolation sinners derive to themselves from this claim of forbearance from their fellow-creatures. Let me beseech all such to consider, that as God cannot be deceived, and will not be mocked, so in truth they usually deceive none but themselves. Every human affection, when it is strong and lively, will discover itself by its apparent effects; and it is as true of religious affections as of any other, that "the tree is known by its fruits."

But if they have reason to suspect themselves, whose change is not visible to others, how much more those who, if they deal faithfully, must confess they are quite strangers to any such thing in their own hearts. I do not mean that every person should be able to give an account of the time and manner of his conversion. This is often effected in so slow and gradual a manner, that it cannot be confined to a precise or particular period. But surely those who are no way sensible of any change in the course of their affections, and the objects at which they are pointed, can scarcely think that they are born again, or be able to affix a proper meaning to so strong an expression. I have read an observation of an eminent author,—That those who cannot remember the time when they were ignorant or unlearned, have reason to conclude that they are so still: because, however slow and insensible the steps of improvement have been, the effects will at last clearly appear, by comparison with an uncultivated state. In the same manner, whoever cannot remember the time when he served the former lusts in his ignorance, has reason to conclude that no change, deserving the name of regeneration, has ever yet taken place.

It will be, perhaps, accounted an exception to this, that some are so early formed for the service of God by his blessing on a pious education, and happily preserved from ever entering upon the destructive paths of vice, that they cannot be supposed to recollect the time when they were at enmity with God. But this is an objection of no consequence. The persons here described have generally so much tenderness of conscience, so deep a sense of the evil of sin, that, of all others, they will most readily discover and confess the workings of corruption in their own hearts, and "that law in their members that warreth against the law of God in their minds." They will be of all others most sensible of the growth of the new, and mortification of the old nature; and will often remember the folly and vanity of youth, in instances that, by most others, would have been reckoned perfectly harmless.

What hath been said in this section is expressly designed to awaken such secure and careless formalists as may have any general belief of the word of God. To be born again must be a great change. Can you then suppose that you have undergone this, not only without any application to it, but without so much as being sensible of it, or being able to discover its proper effects.

SECT. II.—This expression, "Except a man be born again," and other similar expressions, imply, that the change here intended is not merely partial, but universal.

A NEW birth evidently implies a universal change. It must be of the whole man, not in some particulars, but in all, without exception. As this is a truth which naturally arises from the subject, so it is a truth of the last moment and importance, which merits the most serious attention of all those who desire to keep themselves from illusion and self-deception in this interesting question.

Innumerable are the deceits of Satan. If he cannot keep sinners in absolute blindness and security, which is his first attempt, he industriously endeavours to pervert their views of religion, either by causing them to mistake appearances for realities, or substituting a part for the whole. This branch of the subject is of the more consequence, that I am persuaded it is peculiarly applicable to great numbers of the ordinary hearers of the Gospel as such. The great bulk of those who finally fall short of everlasting life, though they lived under the administration of the word and sacraments, are ruined by mistakes of this kind. There are few of them, if any at all, who have at no time, through their whole lives, any serious impressions about their souls, or do nothing in the way of religion. There are still fewer who are speculative unbelievers, and fortify themselves in their profane practices by irreligious principles. The far greatest number do some things, and abstain from others, to quiet the inward complaints of conscience, and must have some broken reed or other on which they may rest their eternal hopes.

It might serve in general to alarm such persons, that, as I have before observed, the change is evidently very great, and therefore they ought not easily to suppose that it is already past. But I now add something still more awakening, that the change, however great, if it is only partial, is not such as is necessary to salvation. There may be a change truly great, in some particulars, from one period of life to another, not only sensible to a man's self, but visible and remarkable to others about him, which yet is not saving, because it is not general, or because it is not permanent. The truth of this observation, that the change must be universal, appears from the constant tenor of the Holy Scriptures. Thus the Psalmist says, "Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect unto all thy commandments," Psalm cxix. 6. And the Apostle James, —"Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all," James, ii. 10. It is, indeed, so much the language of Scripture, that it is needless to insist upon it. God will be served without a rival, and will not share dominion with any in the human heart. But what I am persuaded will be of most use upon this subject, will be to point out, in a few particulars, by what means a partial change is sometimes brought about, and how this differs from that which is saving and universal.

1. In the first place, Sometimes a partial change in point of morals is produced merely by a natural or accidental change in age, temper, or situation. There are different sins to which men are addicted in the different periods or stages of human life. These, of consequence, give way to, and are succeeded by one another. There are, indeed, instances of extraordinary depravation in some persons, who, "selling themselves," like Ahab, to work iniquity, become the slaves of almost every evil habit incident to human nature. These, however, are esteemed monsters even by the world in general, who continue in the commission of every sin while they can, and burn with desires after them when they cannot. But it often happens that the folly and levity, nay, even the dissolute licentiousness of youth, gives way to the ambitious projects of riper years, and the hurry of an active life; and these again are succeeded by sordid, selfish, and covetous old age. In many cases the sins are changed, but the disposition to sin, and aversion from God, remain still the same. One sin may be easily supplanted by another in a heart that is wholly a stranger to renewing grace. How greatly, then, may men deceive themselves, by drawing favourable conclusions from even a great and remarkable change in some one or more particulars, while they continue under the government of sins of a different kind. It is of small consequence which of the commandments of God are transgressed, since they are all of equal and indispensable obligation. It is of little moment for a man to get rid of one distemper by contracting another equally inveterate and as certainly mortal. What profit was it to the Pharisee that he was not an extortioner like the publican? his pride rendered him still more odious and detestable in the sight of God.

I may add here, that besides the common and necessary change of age and temper, a change of situation, employment, and connections will sometimes wean a man from one sin, and introduce an attachment to another. If the temptation is removed, the fire may be extinguished for want of fuel. The inclination to sin in some kinds may be thus occasionally weakened, or the commission of it rendered impossible. It is easy to see that such a change as this can be of no avail in the sight of God; or rather, to speak more properly, it is only an apparent, and no real change at all. It is a difference of effect from an alteration of circumstances, but arising from the very same cause. Are there not many who may apply this reflection to themselves? Are there not many who have ceased to sin in some respects, because they have begun to sin in others? Are there not many who are abused and deceived by this delusive view? who take comfort to themselves by remembering some species of sins or follies which they now sincerely and heartily despise? Take heed that this be not entirely owing to your progress through life, or a change of circumstances and situation. Are you not still living as much to yourselves as ever? as much averse from a life of love to and communion with God as ever? Remember, that though your conduct may be wiser and more prudent, and your character more respectable in the world than before, this is no proof of regeneration; and "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

2. Sometimes a partial change is produced by strong occasional convictions, either from the word or providence of God. There are many instances in which convictions of sin

are raised in the minds of the hearers of the Gospel, which continue in great force for some time, and have a partial effect which still remains. Even a Felix is sometimes made to tremble at the thought of a judgment to come. It is very certain, that natural conscience, when awakened by the word of God, will both restrain from sin and excite to duty, even while sin hath the dominion upon the whole. As the spirit lusteth against the flesh, and the flesh against the spirit, in believers, so conscience, the divine witness in the hearts of unbelievers, may urge to the practice of duty in a certain measure, when it is not able to change the heart inwardly and universally. It may deter from sins to which the attachment is less strong, even whilst it is not able to expel a darling lust, or to dethrone a favourite idol. There is a remarkable example of this character in Herod, and his behaviour to John the Baptist. We are told by the Evangelist Mark, that Herod "feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and observed him; and when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly," Mark, vi. 20. That is to say, he did many such things as were least contrary to the bent of corrupt affection. But that the change was not entire is plain; for when he was reproved for his beloved lust, it only served to inflame his resentment, and he took away the life of his reprover. We find that Ahab, king of Israel, of whom it is said, that "he did more to provoke the Lord God of Israel to anger than all that went before him," yet humbled himself on the denunciation of divine wrath, and was so far penitent as served to procure a suspension of the temporal stroke.

It appears, indeed, from innumerable instances in Scripture, as well as from daily experience, that there are temporary convictions raised in the minds of many, both by the word and providence of God. It is also certain that there are imperfect effects of these convictions, which often continue a considerable time, or rather are perpetual, though they are still only partial. Many sinners, though they continue unrenewed, yet dare not return to the same unbounded licence as before. Nay, there are some sins, under the penal effects of which they have severely smarted, which they never dare afterwards to indulge. We have a very remarkable national instance of this imperfect reformation in the Jews. They were at first shamefully and amazingly prone to idolatry, and continued so under repeated strokes, till the terrible desolation they met with at the Babylonish captivity. From that period, however, notwithstanding their great guilt in other particulars, they never returned to idolatry, but to this day continue to have the deepest abhorrence of that capital crime.

There are many particular persons in the same situation. Some sins which have lain heavy on their consciences, or for which they have severely suffered in the course of providence, they will not commit; but others, one or more, which may be called their "own iniquity," they hold fast, and will not let them go. Are there not different degrees of depravation and obstinacy to be found in different sinners, as well as different degrees of holiness, obedience, and submission in the children of God? And though there is usually a progress in the first to the worst, as well as in the last to the better, yet still there may be particular sins which they dare not commit, and particular duties which they diligently discharge. Nay, this partial character is often the very thing that blinds their minds, and continues their security in an habitual alienation of heart from the life and power of true religion.

Are there not many customary Christians who have a form of godliness, and, though they are utter strangers to communion with God, yet nothing will induce them to part with their form? Are there not many whom it would be unjust to brand with the grosser crimes of profane swearing, sensual riot, or unclean lust, who yet have their hearts set upon the world, which they love and pursue, and on which they rest with complacency as their sweetest portion? Are all outwardly decent and sober persons ready to take up the cross and follow their Master without the camp? Are they ready to forsake "houses, and brethren, and sisters, and lands, yea, and their own life also, for his sake and the Gospel's?" And yet without this they cannot be his disciples. There are many hard sayings in religion, which ordinary professors cannot bear, and with which they never comply. Remember the case of the young man who came to our Saviour, and spoke with so much modesty and discretion, but could not bear this great trial: "Then Jesus beholding him, loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest; go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come, take up the cross, and follow me. And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved; for he had great possessions," Mark, x. 21, 22.

3. Sometimes a partial change is produced in a great measure even by the love and attachment which men have to some one darling and governing sin. The less willing they are to cut off the right hand, and to pluck out the right eye, the more zealous and diligent they will be in other things, to atone for the indulgence, or to cover it from their own observation. How careful is a pharisee to tithe mint, anise, and cummin, while he neglects the weightier matters of the law! How does he "make broad his phylacteries,

and enlarge the borders of his garment," while he is defective in "judgment, mercy, and faith!" How did the ancient Jews come with thousands of rams, and ten thousand rivers of oil, while living in the habitual neglect of some of the most important branches of the Divine law! We have an apposite example of this in the conduct of Saul, when sent against Amalek: he spared of the spoil what was good, though he was commanded to destroy it, and then pretended to make a free uncommanded offering of sacrifice unto God, for which he met with this just and severe reprimand: "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams," 1 Sam. xv. 22. We see every day innumerable instances of the same kind; when there is any sin which men are willing to spare, which they defend with arguments, or palliate with excuses, they are so much the more ready to overdo in such duties as are not so contrary to the present current of unsanctified affection. From all this, you will plainly see, that no man ought to judge of himself by the greatness of the change in any particular, unless it is universal, and without exception.

Sect. III.—From these words, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," and other similar expressions in the Holy Scriptures, we may infer, that the change here intended is not merely external and imperfect, but inward, essential, and complete.

I might have divided this observation into two parts, and treated of them separately: first, shewing that it is not an outward and apparent only, but an internal and real change; secondly, that it is not an imperfect change, or difference in degree only, but a complete and essential change of the whole character. But as the illustration of these two must have necessarily in a great measure coincided, and they are very closely connected, I have chosen to join them together.

That what shall be said on this subject may be the more useful and profitable, I will endeavour to explain, in as distinct and simple a manner as I am able, what you are to understand by the above remark. The first part of it will be most easily comprehended, that it is not an external only, but an internal change; that the most apparently strict and regular conversation, the most faultless discharge of outward duties, will not be sufficient, while the heart continues enslaved to sin in general, or under the dominion of any particular lust. The other part of the remark is, that the change must not only be imperfect, or in degree, but essential and complete. That is to say, it is not sufficient that a man be somewhat less wicked than before, that he not only gives up some sin, but uses moderation in others; nay, though he be under some degree of restraint universally; if still there is not what may be called an essential change of character, if still sin has the ascendency upon the whole, though its dominion be not so uncontrolled as before.

Sin may certainly have the chief seat in the affections, though it hath not altogether quiet and peaceable possession. There must always be some governing principle, which, properly speaking, constitutes the character. As our Saviour tells us, "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other; ye cannot serve God and Mammon," Mat. vi. 24. Grace and corruption are opposite in their natures, and mutually destructive of each other, so far as they prevail; and therefore the great question is, not how far any of them is altered from what it was formerly in itself, but how far it prevails in opposition to the other, and hath truly the government of the man. I find it extremely difficult to communicate this truth in a simple and intelligible manner, so as to be level to the meanest capacities. And it is little wonder; for here lies the chief part of the deceitfulness of sin. It will, I hope, be better understood by what is now to be added, both for its proof and illustration.

That what I have above asserted is agreeable to the analogy of faith, and a part of the will of God, may easily be made appear. It is the constant uniform doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. There we find it is the peculiar prerogative of God, that he seeth and judgeth the heart. By this his knowledge is distinguished from, and excels all created understanding, and, therefore, as no appearance will deceive, so no insincere profession will be accepted by him: "For the Lord seeth not as man seeth, for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart," 1 Sam. xvi. 7. To this purpose is the exhortation of David to his son Solomon: "And thou, Solomon, my son, know thou the God of thy father, and serve him with a perfect heart, and with a willing mind: for the Lord searcheth all hearts, and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts," 1 Chron. xxviii. 9.

The stress that is laid on this in Scripture, and the frequent repetition of the word "heart," can hardly have escaped the notice even of the most cursory reader, or the most superficial observer. We find the consent of the heart required as indispensably and chiefly necessary, and that as distinguished from outward and apparent obedience, which, without it, will be of no value. "My son, give me thine heart," says Solomon, "and let thine eyes observe my ways," Prov. xxiii. 26. We find an inward change of heart and disposition promised by God as the work of his Spirit and grace: "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh: and I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them," Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27. We find the same thing implored by penitent sinners, as necessary to their recovery: "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me," Psal. li. 10. And we find the duty of returning penitents prescribed in the very same terms: "Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" Ezek. xviii. 31.

I shall only farther observe, that we find in Scripture an integrity of heart required to real religion; that is to say, that the love of God must be the commanding, governing principle, that there must be no divided or rival affection suffered to remain: "For the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul," Deut. xiii. 3. The first duty of the moral law runs in these terms: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," Matt. xxii. 37, which, as a precept of the Gospel, is explained by the following passage: "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me," Matt. x. 37. If, to any, the collecting of so many passages of Scripture seem tedious, it is entirely owing to the abundance and commonness of them. It were easy to have added ten times the number to those which have been already quoted, a circumstance to which I particularly beg the reader's attention, as it sets in the strongest light the certainty and importance of this truth.

Having so far confirmed and established the observation from the sacred oracles, I would willingly illustrate and apply it a little more particularly. And as truth seldom receives greater light from any thing than from a discovery of the opposite errors, I shall point out by what means sometimes an apparent or imperfect change is produced, which is not inward and essential. This I apprehend will be effected by a view of the following characters, every where to be met with. 1. A character formed upon a well-conducted selfish principle. 2. One that is supremely governed by reputation, and a desire of honour and respect from men. 3. One that is influenced by a religious principle, in which a spirit of bondage and slavish fear chiefly predominates.

In the first place, there is a character in the world which may be said to be formed upon a well-conducted selfish principle. It may be said, indeed, in general, of every unrenewed person, that in such a heart God is dethroned, and self, in one shape or other, is exalted, is set in his place, and reigns in his stead: but what I have chiefly in view at present is, to point out the character of those who, in all those parts of their conduct which assume the name of religion or of virtue, are chiefly actuated not by a sense of duty, but by an intention to promote their own present satisfaction and comfort. It is the language of experience and sound reason, as well as of the word of God, "that the wicked worketh a deceitful work." There are many immediate and sensible bad consequences of vice and wickedness. Some who have already smarted under their effects, may, therefore, in many instances, avoid them, without any due sense of the evil of sin, as against the law of God, or taking his service as their hearty and unfeigned choice.

Let us give some examples of this. A man may avoid intemperance and excess, purely or chiefly because it is hurtful to his health, and introduces such disorders into his frame as incapacitate him for relishing even the pleasures of the world and of sense. A man may find from experience, that, being injurious to others in word or in deed, nay, even resenting the injuries done to himself, raises him up so many enemies, and so inflames every little incident, as greatly disturbs his peace. He may, therefore, be patient and forbearing, whilst it is not owing to any weakness of mind, or government of his passions from a sense of duty, but merely to the strength of his judgment, and his falling upon the fittest way of promoting his own ease. It is precisely this sort of men who may often be observed to be reasonable, modest, and self-denied, in their deportment in the world in general, but savage and tyrannical, or peevish and discontented in their own families, where there are none upon equal terms with them, or able to make a formidable resistance to them. A wise man may, upon the whole, by reflection discover, that what gives the highest relish and poignancy to all sensible enjoyments is, to habituate himself to some degree of self-denial, to conduct them with decency, and to use them with sobriety and moderation. When this conduct, as, indeed, is commonly the case, is the fruit of experience, it is so sensible a change, that it often passes itself not only on others, but even on the person concerned, for a religious change. But if the change is not inward as well as outward; if the affections still flow in the same channel, though they are better hemmed in, and preserved from impetuosity and excess; if the source of happiness is still the same, though it is more sparingly or more wisely indulged; it is plainly the old nature, and the person cannot be said to be born again.

He is outwardly regular, and comparatively less wicked than before, but cannot be said to love and serve God "with all his heart, and with all his soul."

We may learn from this a very important lesson,—to distinguish between human virtue and religion, between a decent and blameless carriage upon motives of present conveniency, and a new nature, or a gracious state. I know some are highly dissatisfied at making any distinction of this nature: but is it not plainly possible, that such a character as is above described may exist? Is it not also plain, for reasons too obvious to be insisted on, that it cannot deserve the name of a new or spiritual birth? And is it not, therefore, the duty of ministers of the Gospel to put men in mind of this, as well as every other source of self-deceit? Nay, the necessity in one view is greatest in such a case as this, that we may warn those of their danger who have a name to live while they are dead, that we may shake the stronghold of the presumptuous self-applauding formalist, who is often more deaf and insensible to the things that belong to his peace, than the most abandoned profligate.

Is there any one ready to say, Why do you take upon you to judge the heart, and ascribe what you must confess to be excellent and amiable in itself, to wrong motives, and an irreligious principle? I answer, I judge no man's heart; but, while I leave it to the decisive judgment of God, would willingly subject its actings to its own review. It is but an appeal to the inward court of conscience, or rather a citation of the person, with conscience as the witness, to the tribunal of Him that "trieth the reins and the heart." But, after all, there is no difficulty in going a step farther. We may often know the tree by its fruits; we may often discern the falsehood of these plausible moralists by an habitual worldliness of temper and conversation, by a great indifference about the ordinances and worship of God; nay, sometimes by a bold and avowed opposition to vital, experimental religion, to the language and exercises of the spiritual life.

To prevent the misunderstanding of what hath been said, it will be necessary to observe, that I intend not to deny the propriety or the use of these assistant motives, as they may be called, which arise from the present benefit and advantage of true religion. I have said only, that the obedience or reformation which flows from no higher principle, is not such as will be acceptable to God; it is not that change which is necessary before we can enter into life eternal. There are, however, various uses to which these considerations may justly, and ought in duty to be applied. They ought to satisfy us of the excellence and truth of religion in general, and to be produced in opposition to the licentious and profane topics of conversation so often to be met with in promiscuous company. When any one begins to declaim in favour of lust and sensuality, and alleges that nature has given us desires, and why should it give them but in order to their gratification? let the hearer immediately observe, that, by the corruption of nature, our appetites are greatly inflamed, and not at all in a sound state; that, as is plain from the most incontestable experience, the best and most desirable enjoyment of any sensible delights is that thankful, self-denied, moderate use of them which the word of God authorizes or prescribes.

The same reflections may very properly serve for awakening grosser sinners to a sense of their danger. The prodigal seems to have been first brought to himself by a deep reflection upon his own folly. But he did not rest here; he did not content himself with endeavouring to recover, by sobriety and industry, the wealth which he had squandered away, but returned to his father for the forgiveness of his crime. In the same manner, no doubt, the loss of health, substance, and reputation, should convince the sinner of the evil of his ways. This argument is used by the Apostle Paul: "What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed?" Rom. vi. 21. But I would never call that religion, which proceeds to no higher views; nor that repentance, which is completed by no better principle.

Such reflections should also be improved by every good man, to impress his mind with a deep sense of the goodness of God. Every thing that he commands is truly most eligible in itself, and most beneficial to us. His will is as gracious as his authority is absolute. Religion's "ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace," Prov. iii. 17. Well might our blessed Master say, "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls: for my yoke is easy, and my burden is light," Matt. xi. 29, 30. This should daily dispose us to thankfulness to that God who surrounds us with his care, and who follows us with loving-kindness and with tender mercies. His very restraints are favours, his commands are blessings.

Is it possible to avoid adding, that the same views should be made use of to fortify us against temptation? When a sense of duty is the prevailing desire, we may very safely corroborate it with all these inferior considerations. It should make sin the more hateful and abominable, and prevent us from yielding to that party which still secretly pleads for it in our imperfectly sanctified hearts.

Before I leave this branch of the subject, I must speak a few words to sinners of a different character. If, then, many decent and regular persons are, nevertheless, under the wrath of God, what terror should this give to the more openly profane, who are living instances of gross wickedness? How many are there to be found among us—nay, how many appear from Sabbath to Sabbath in our worshipping assemblies—who live in the habitual practice of some of the most notorious crimes! How many, who live in a bold defiance of the truths and laws of our great Master, who are not only stained with original pollution, but labouring under a daily increasing load of actual guilt! Are there not some swearers and blasphemers of the great and dreadful name of God? some despisers and profaners of his holy day? some who add drunkenness to thirst, wasting the creatures of God by dissipating their own substance, defacing the image of God by undermining their own health, at one and the same time procuring and hastening their final destruction? Are there not some walking in the lust of uncleanness? some retaining, without restitution, the gain of unrighteousness? Is it not surprising that such do not tremble at the word of God? Can there be any doubt that all of the above characters are unrenewed? Is there any pretence for their deceiving themselves? There is no just excuse even for the more regular and sober building their hope on a false foundation, but there is not so much as a shadow of excuse for them. Dare any such entertain a doubt of a judgment to come? Can any mortal be insensible of the precariousness of time? The king of terrors lays his hand upon one after another, as he receives a commission from the King of kings; and it is distressing to think in what an unprepared state many receive the summons, which, nevertheless, they must of necessity obey.

Whoever thou art that readest these lines, if thou art yet unrenewed, but, particularly, if thou art one of those whose sins are open and manifest, I beseech thee in the most earnest manner to be reconciled unto God. "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation. God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." The blood of this Saviour is of infinite value. His Spirit is of irresistible efficacy. He is "able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him." Delay not one moment. Give immediate thanks that thou art not already in the place of torment. Believe in the Son of God for righteousness and strength. Add not to all thy other sins against him, by undervaluing his atonement, and despairing of mercy. And may it please God, by his own power, to reach thy heart, to snatch thee as a brand from the burning, and to make thee an everlasting monument of his grace and love.

2. In the second place, we may often find an appearance of religion or virtue in a character, supremely governed by reputation, or a desire of respect and honour from the world. I say supremely governed, because no doubt there may be a mixture of other principles, whilst this is the leading, the directing, and the governing view. I am sensible there are some who have no other view of any kind by a religious profession than to deceive others, and, under the fair disguise of piety and seeming devotion, to carry on with more security and success their unrighteous designs. That some such are to be found in the world, sad experience is a melancholy proof. The greatness of their guilt it is not easy to conceive, and still more difficult to express. As it must always proceed upon a known deliberate contempt of God, there is usually such a hardness of heart and searedness of conscience attending it, that there is little probability of making any impression upon them; or rather, to speak more properly, they have all the symptoms of being given up of God, and left to themselves. But there is something extremely harsh and unnatural in suspecting any of wilful, deliberate hypocrisy, till it is plainly and openly detected. The truth is, I am persuaded, that as it is a dreadful, so it is a rare character. The far greater part of those who are under the power of hypocrisy, deceive themselves as much as, or rather more than the world. These last fall more properly in my way to be considered, as having undergone a seeming, or apparent, without any real change.

In order to illustrate the character and state of those who are supremely governed by reputation or a desire of honour and respect, it will be proper to observe, that as the law of God is a transcript of his own perfect inherent excellence, true religion must be in itself amiable and lovely. Nay, it must appear so, even in the eyes of those who are engaged in a stated opposition to its interest. You will say, How is this possible? Is it not a manifest contradiction? I answer, That though the spirit and principles from which true religion must flow, be directly contrary to the bent of an unrenewed heart, yet their effects are both amiable and beneficial. Bad men cannot endure inward mortification and self-denial, being humbled as sinners in the sight of God, justified freely by his grace, sanctified by his Spirit, and having nothing whereof to glory. Against these vital principles of piety the natural mind sets itself with violence, and the unrenewed heart rises with indignation. But the effect of true religion, or a diligent compliance with the duties of the moral law, as it is amiable in itself, so it is also of good report among men. We are told in Scripture, "that the righteous is more excellent than his neighbour." And the Apostle Paul exhorts us to our duty in the following terms: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things," Phil. iv. 8. Does not this at once discover how many may attain to a considerable degree of regularity in the practice of their duty, while their governing principle is no better than a desire of the esteem of others. That character acquires a value in their eyes, which is in general repute, and will set them in the most favourable light. This hath often a secret and insensible influence, to which they themselves do not attend. What favours the deceit is, that many of the very same duties are commanded in the law of God, and reputable in the sight of man. They gladly embrace them therefore as the service of God: it pleases them to think, they shall by this means be acceptable to him. They fondly flatter themselves, that this is the chief ground of their choice, and are not sensible that they are but offering incense to their own vanity. Self-partiality often hides the truth from our view, and conceals the chief springs and motives of action. Since disorder was introduced into the human frame by sin, there is no creature whose character is so mixed, variable, inconsistent, and self-contradictory as man. Other creatures are regular and uniform, and steadily fulfil their functions; their nature and disposition may be known without ambiguity, and they always reach their end. But man is, as it were, torn to pieces by the conflicting principles of light and darkness; and from the different and contrary symptoms which often appear, it is hard to tell in what class he should be ranged.

From this will evidently appear, the necessity of an inward and essential change. That which is done to gain the applause of men, will never be reckoned an acceptable part of the service of God. On the contrary, he holds it in the highest detestation. See the exhortation of our Saviour: "Take heed that you do not your alms before men, to be seen of them; otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven," Matt. vi. 1. I cannot help observing here, that men of this character may be divided into two classes, who commonly state themselves in opposition to, and have the greatest hatred or contempt for each other, and yet are actuated by one common principle.

There are some who seem chiefly to confine their views to a fair and honourable carriage in their correspondence and commerce between man and man. These are commonly persons of higher rank, and all who desire to emulate them, and wish to be classed with them. In such, honour holds the place of religion; or, at least, is a superior or more powerful principle. They would not willingly stain their reputation with any thing that is base or mean, according to the standard they have formed to themselves of decency of character, and dignity of carriage. This standard of decency, however, is very changeable. It is either more narrow or more extensive, according to the sentiments of those with whom they most frequently converse. And there is often some mixture of religion, which serves under, and co-operates with the commanding motive.

There are vast multitudes of this character in the present age, who cannot be described in juster or more significant terms than those of the Apostle Paul; they are "conformed to this world." They tread in its steps, they act upon its maxims, they ask its approbation, and they have their reward.

How far such persons are from being renewed in the spirit of their mind, and how much they are the servants of men, may be plainly discovered by the following sign; that they are almost as much ashamed of unfashionable duties, as of dishonourable crimes. How different is their boasted dignity of mind from a truly holy resolution and Christian magnanimity! Are there not some, whose integrity in ordinary cases may be depended on, and who would abhor the thought of a mean and dirty action, as it is usually styled, but who would be covered with nearly equal shame, if surprised in any act of devotion, as if detected in dishonesty and fraud? How many, who would brave the king of terrors in the field of battle, from a sense of honour; but who, though far from being infidels, have not sufficient courage to worship, in their families, the great Creator and Preserver of men! Such may see the reception they shall meet with at last, and even feel the justice of their own condemnation in these words of our Saviour: "Whosoever, therefore, shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels," Mark, viii. 38.

There are others of a different stamp, who seek the approbation of men, more by an appearance of piety and devotion, than the duties of the first table of the law. That there are some such also, not only the word of God, but daily experience puts beyond all doubt or question. "This people," saith our Lord, "draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me," Matt. xv. 8. I set aside, both in this and in the former instance, the case of gross, intended, and deliberate hypocrisy. But are there not many who, in their religious duties, seem chiefly to have in view the attaining or preserving the esteem and approbation of others? They are not determined from any inward and personal conviction of the excellence or necessity of religion; but from their youth up they have still heard religion spoken of with reverence, and seen religious persons treated with respect. This makes them consider an entire neglect of religious duties as shameful rather than sinful; and some degree of professed attachment to them, as necessary to their character and credit.

This, like many other motives, has a strong, though at the same time an insensible influence, and when mixed with imperfect convictions of sin, will produce no small degree of regularity in religious exercises, while yet the heart is habitually set upon the world. In whatever age or place there is a regular and settled administration of the ordinances of Christ, there will be many whose religion is no more than a blind imitation of others, and a desire of some title to that character which is in esteem and repute for the time being. Wherever there is much real, there will also be much counterfeit religion. Wherever there is much true piety, it is always loaded with the dead weight of many customary professors. Wherever there is much outward esteem waiting upon the servants of God, there will always be many of those fair-weather Christians, who follow Christ whilst the profession is honourable, but are unacquainted with that part of his service which consists in taking up the cross, and suffering reproach. Their character is well described by our Saviour, under the image of seed falling upon stony places. "He that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it, yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended," Matt. xiii. 20, 21.

3. In the third place, there is still another character, different from both the former, in which there may be an apparent and imperfect, while there is no complete and essential change. The character I have now in view is formed upon religious principles, but in which a spirit of bondage and slavish fear greatly predominates. It is often difficult, according to the Scripture expression, rightly to divide the word of truth; it is difficult to point out the errors by which men deceive themselves, and mistake the shadow for the substance, and at the same time to caution them so distinctly, as that serious persons may not be alarmed, and have their peace and comfort interrupted by unnecessary or ill-grounded fears. Perhaps there are few subjects in which this difficulty is greater, than the one I have now mentioned. I pray that God, for Christ's sake, may enable me to open the truth in such a manner, as may convince and awaken those who have hitherto built with untempered mortar, and may give additional peace and consolation to those who have "fled for refuge, to lay hold of the hope set before them."

That it is of importance to open this character, every one may, upon a little reflection, be sensible. There are many who will not find themselves included in any of the two former. Upon the most candid examination, conscience bears them witness that they have more in view than merely present ease and comfort, or the approbation of others. They have often a strong impression of the importance of an endless eternity. This hath a sensible and considerable influence upon their conduct, and is a motive quite distinct from worldly pleasure. It compels them to duties out of the reach of human observation, and therefore they cannot think that the praise of men is their highest aim.

But are there not many such under the dominion of fear? that is to say, conscience, in some measure awakened, denounces vengeance against the breaches of the law of God: providential dispensations fill them with a terror of Divine power; they know they cannot live always, and tremble to think what shall become of them after death. Well, perhaps the reader will say with some surprise, is this wrong? No, so far their exercise coincides with that of real penitents. But here, if I may so express it, the ways part asunder: the real penitent, by a discovery of the intrinsic evil of sin, of the mercy of God, and the great foundation of a sinner's hope, is led in the way of peace: his heart is truly changed, and brought under the influence of the love of God, whom he obeys as his Lawgiver, to whom he submits as his Lord, and in whom he rests as his portion. But there are others, who by abstinence from some sins, against which the reproofs of conscience are most distinct and severe, and by the formal discharge of many religious duties, endeavour to lessen their fears; to lay a foundation for a precarious peace; and as it were, by a costly sacrifice, to purchase an immunity from hell. Fear not only awakens, but continues to govern them; they lay down a legal system of obedience and self-righteousness, but all the while they drag the yoke with great impatience. They do not hate sin from their hearts, on its own account, but are afraid that they shall burn for ever for committing it. They do not love God, but they fear, because they know that they cannot resist him. They do not engage in his service with cheerfulness, or delight in it as their choice, but groan under it as a burden. Their hearts and affections are set upon present and temporal enjoyments; but they apply themselves in some measure to the duties of religion, because they know they cannot keep the world always; and submit to it as rather better and more tolerable than everlasting misery.

The frequency of this character will stand in need of little proof. If the features are justly drawn, I am persuaded they will be easily known, for they are very common. Are there not many who may justly suspect themselves to be actuated by no higher motive than the fear of wrath? Does not this plainly shew itself by your backward, heartless, cold discharge of duty; your regret and sorrow in parting with, and frequent relapses into sin? Is not your religion temporary and changeable? Does it not rise and fall with the sensible tokens of the Divine presence and power? Have you not trembled on a sick-bed, or other time of danger; humbled yourself before God, cried for relief, and promised amendment? But has not your resolution relaxed upon your recovery, and your diligence borne proportion to the supposed nearness or distance of the danger? Is not this then manifestly the effect of fear; and may not the words of the Psalmist be justly applied to all such? "When he slew them, then they sought him; and they returned, and inquired early after God: and they remembered that God was their Rock, and the high God their Redeemer: nevertheless, they did flatter him with their mouth, and they lied unto him with their tongues; for their heart was not right with him, neither were they steadfast in his covenant," Psal. lxxviii. 34—37.

Few things, I apprehend, will be of more importance than to shew, in a clear and satisfying manner, that the obedience or religious performances that are influenced by no higher motive than fear, are not acceptable to God, nor any sufficient evidence of a renewed heart. This, indeed, is equally plain from many passages of Scripture, and from the nature and reason of the thing. It appears from all those passages formerly cited, and many others where mention is made of the inclination of the heart and will, of which obedience on compulsion can be no manner of proof. It appears undeniably, from the great commandment of the law, and sum of practical religion, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind," Luke, x. 27. It appears from what is always represented as the great commanding and constraining motive of the Gospel: "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again," 2 Cor. v. 14. To the same purpose the Apostle John says, — "We have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him," 1 John, iv. 16. We find in Scripture that there is a direct opposition stated between the spirit of genuine converts under the Gospel, and a spirit of bondage or slavish fear: "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father," Rom. viii. 15. So says the same apostle to Timothy: "For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind," 2 Tim. i. 7.

The truth is, it is equally plain from the nature and reason of the thing. That which is done only or chiefly from fear, cannot be any evidence of the change that is acceptable to God, because, properly speaking, it is no real or inward change at all. The effects of sin are restrained or controlled by superior power, but the inclination to it remains still the same. It is a common and known principle, that whatever is the effect of compulsion or force upon the agent, whether it be good or evil in itself, hath nothing moral in its nature. The sword that commits murder, and that which executes justice, deserves equal blame or praise, or rather, neither of them deserves either the one or the other. A detected thief, compelled to make restitution, or loaded with chains, so that he cannot steal, does not thereby become honest in his nature.

The case is precisely the same with those who, in their religious duties, are under the government of fear, although it be the fear of their almighty Judge. From any similar instance between man and man, we may at once be sensible of this truth. If one man is willing to over-reach another, but, through his adversary's superior skill, is not able, or, terrified by threatenings, is not bold enough to attempt it, what character does he bear or deserve but that of a disappointed knave? What parent or master will be satisfied with the obedience of a child or servant who plainly discovers that he hates his commands and grieves at his authority? It is true, as man can only judge with certainty of the outward appearance, this circumstance must be left out of every system of human government. We can make no laws on earth to punish the intention; but so much we know of it as may make us sensible what all such deserve, and shall receive at the hand of God, whose prerogative it is that he knoweth and judgeth the secrets of all hearts.

I shall only farther observe, that the same thing appears, in the clearest manner, from the nature of that happiness which is prepared for the children of God in the life to come. It is purely spiritual, as it is perfectly holy; it consists in the knowledge of God, in the exercise of love to him, in conformity to his nature, and the execution of his will. Those who are under the dominion of fear, who have no love to God, but only desire to avoid his wrath, will certainly find, that though it were possible for them to escape hell, they neither deserve nor are able to relish the employment and happiness of heaven. As the commands of God are a burden to them on earth, his immediate presence would be a still more insupportable burden in heaven. From all this, I hope it appears evidently, that a character may be formed upon religious principles, and yet, if it is never carried farther than a restraint by fear, it is not that change which is necessary to salvation.

It will not be improper, or rather, it will be absolutely necessary to make a reflection or two upon this branch of the subject, for its improvement, and to prevent its being mistaken or misapplied. For this purpose, let it be observed, that we must carefully distinguish the slavish dread above explained from that dutiful reverential fear which every child of God is still bound to preserve upon his mind of his Father who is in heaven. Of the first kind it is said, "There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment: he that feareth is not made perfect in love," 1 John, iv. 18. In proportion as the love of God prevails, the first sort of fear is banished; but the other is so far from being banished, that it rather increases. This is no other than a profound veneration of the unspeakable greatness and glory of God, and particularly of his holiness and purity, which should bring every creature prostrate before him. We find, in the vision of Isaiah, the heavenly hosts represented as deeply penetrated with such a discovery. "In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple: above it stood the seraphims; each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, HOLY, HOLY, HOLY is the Lord of hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory," Isaiah, vi. 1—3.

This not only may, but ought, in us to be acompanied with a fear of the punishment incurred by sin: at the same time, it must be inseparably connected with, or rather founded upon a sense of the holiness of his nature, the purity of his law, and the justice of his vengeance. On the contrary, that fear of God which prevails in the unregenerate is founded only on the terror of his power, as a natural attribute. It is like the struggling of a chained slave, who "gnaws his tongue for pain," who is not satisfied with the equity of the law which he has transgressed, and cannot admit the justice of that sentence, the execution of which he apprehends.

There is no inconsistency at all between the fear and love which terminate on the correspondent attributes of God, majesty and mercy. A Christian may and ought to grow in a sense of the divine presence, and reverential dread of the divine majesty, and so be still more afraid of sinning; at the same time, he may also grow in a sweet calm and composure of mind, a fiducial trust and reliance on the divine faithfulness and mercy; just as, on the other hand, some sinners evidently increase both in presumption and timidity. During a great part of their lives they act without reflection and without restraint, and yet, at particular seasons, they are in a manner distracted with terror: nay, though it often happens that gross wickedness sears the conscience, and produces an insensibility and hardness of heart, there are instances of the greatest profligates being liable to the most alarming fears.* Let us never, therefore, confound things so very opposite as a fear of the living God, joined to an inward and hearty approbation of his commands, and that unwilling obedience or abstinence which views him as a stern tyrant, and trembles at the thought of his wrath.

It will be farther necessary to observe, that as a slavish fear is to be entirely distinguished from that which is filial and dutiful, so no doubt there is often, even in real Christians, a mixture of the spirit of bondage itself, though they are supremely governed by a better principle. This is not to be wondered at, since they are sanctified but in part. There is a strong remainder of sin and corruption in them of different kinds, and, among the rest, a very blameable degree of unbelief and distrust. How many are there whose comfort is lessened, and whose hands hang down, through an excessive fear of death, the last enemy! What a refreshment should it be to all such to think of this end of our Saviour's coming, to "deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject unto bondage," Heb. ii. 15. For their sakes, I am persuaded it will not be disagreeable that, in the close of this section, I lay down a few marks by which they may be enabled to judge whether this slavish fear predominates or not.

(1.) First, then, Christian, whether or not is your fear of wrath immediately connected with a sense of the evil of sin? Do you see these two things in their inseparable relation to, and mutual influence upon, one another? Do you fear wrath as the effect of sin, and sin as the just cause of wrath? Have you no fault to find with this connection? Do you plead guilty before God, and confess that you are without excuse? Is sin truly hateful in itself, and your own unhappy proneness to it an habitual burden? The language of a believer is the same with that of the Apostle Paul,—"Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful. For we know that the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin," Rom. vii. 12—14. In those who are under the dominion of fear, there is no just sense of the evil of sin; there is a proneness to extenuate it, an inclination to justify it, and a continual attempt to forget or conceal it. The crime is still sweet, though the punishment is terrible. They are not satisfied to find that God is so holy, so just, and so powerful. With them, his government is arbitrary, his law is severe, his nature implacable; and, instead of changing their own disposition, they would much rather wish a change in his will.

---

* We are told that Nero, though he adventured to perpetrate some of the most horrid crimes, was yet so easily terrified, that a thunder-storm used to make him hide himself under a bed.

(2.) Whether does your fear of God drive you from his presence, or excite a strong desire of reconciliation and peace? The slavish fear which is not attended with any just views of the divine mercy, clothes God with terror, and makes him the object of aversion. This is plainly the first effect of sin. It was so in the case of Adam, who, as soon as he had lost his integrity, when he heard God's voice in the garden, fled and hid himself. We find the same sentiment expressed by the men of Bethshemesh, upon an extraordinary token of divine power and jealousy: "And the men of Bethshemesh said, Who is able to stand before this holy Lord God, and to whom shall he go up from us?" 1 Sam. vi. 20. Nay, the same seems to have been the view of the Apostle Peter, when surprised with an astonishing evidence of his Master's power and Godhead. "When Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord," Luke, v. 8.

This disposition is daily manifest in many who are under the dominion of fear. The worship of God is painful to them, his service is a burden, his presence is terrible: they keep at a distance, therefore, as much as they can or dare. Their peace and composure is chiefly owing to their losing themselves, and occupying their minds entirely with different objects. No sign will more surely discover the nature and influence of slavish fear than this. There is a gloom and melancholy spread over every thing in religion to them; when they are engaged in sacred duties, it is a heavy, tiresome task, and they rejoice in getting through them, as a bullock when he is loosed from the yoke. On the other hand, real Christians, though burdened with sinful fear, cannot take refuge in any thing else but God; they dare not take their rest in the creature, but say with God, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him," Job, xiii. 15; or with the Psalmist David, "Yet the Lord will command his loving-kindness in the day-time, and in the night his song shall be with me, and my prayer unto the God of my life," Psa. xlii. 7, 8. Nothing gives relief to such, till they attain to a view of the Divine mercy, and a humble hope of peace and reconciliation.

(3.) Have you comfort and satisfaction in a sense of God's favour, as well as a distressing fear of his wrath? This also will serve to distinguish between those who have no other religion than what fear produces, and those in whom it only maintains a conflict with a better principle. There are some who are restrained from sin, and compelled to many duties, by fear, who may easily see what governs them, because they are altogether strangers to joy and satisfaction in God. This is not, indeed, what they aim at. They have never yet seen his favour as the object of supreme desire. They only believe so far as to tremble, and would fain by composition, so to speak, and some degree of compliance, though reluctant and backward, avoid the Divine wrath. A coldness and constraint runs through all their performances, and they are apt to call in question the reality of joy in God, and communion with him, because they are altogether strangers to it themselves. But all the real children of God desire a sense of his love, as well as grieve or fear under a sense of his displeasure. The light of his reconciled countenance gives them more joy and gladness than the greatest affluence of corn or of wine; and under the severest chastisement, instead of flying from his presence, they say with Job, "O that I knew where I might find him, that I might come even to his seat; I would order my cause before him, and fill my mouth with arguments," Job, xxiii. 3, 4. Nothing, indeed, can be more proper than calling the one a filial, and the other a slavish fear; for great is the difference between a child fearing the displeasure of a parent whom he sincerely loves, and a slave dreading the resentment of an enraged tyrant, whose service he abhors.

Sect. IV.—From this metaphor, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," and other parallel expressions in the Holy Scriptures, we may learn that the change here intended is supernatural.

When I say it is a supernatural change, I mean that it is what man cannot by his own power effect, without superior or Divine aid. As we are by nature in a state of enmity and opposition to God, so this is what we cannot "of ourselves" remove or overcome. The exercise of our own rational powers, the persuasion of others, the application of all moral motives of every kind, will be ineffectual, without the special operation of the Spirit and grace of God. Thus the Apostle John describes those who believe in the name of Christ: "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God," John, i. 13. And thus the Apostle Paul expresses himself: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost," Tit. iii. 5. There is no part of the Scripture doctrine which the natural man hears with greater aversion, or opposes with greater violence: It gives so humbling a view of our own character and state, and stands so directly opposed to pride and self-sufficiency, that it cannot be truly acceptable to any, till they are brought to a saving acquaintance with its power and efficacy. However, it hath been this "foolishness of preaching," or rather, this commonly esteemed foolish part of preaching, that God hath most remarkably blessed for the salvation of souls. I will therefore endeavour to shew, in as plain and satisfying a manner as I am able, that this is the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures; and then to vindicate it from the chief objections that are usually raised against it.

How many passages of Scripture are there, that speak in the strongest terms, not only of our miserable, but helpless state before conversion! Thus the apostle to the Ephesians: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins," Eph. ii. 1. And again: "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace ye are saved,") Eph. ii. 4, 5. In his epistle to the Colossians, he repeats the same thing: "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses," Col. ii. 13. The reader must know, that in many other passages the same truth is to be found, couched under the same or like metaphors; such as "blindness, darkness, hardness of heart." The force of the expression is seldom sufficiently attended to. Suffer me then to put the question, Do you give credit to the Holy Scriptures? Do you form your opinions, without partiality or prejudice, from them? Then you must receive it as truth, that man, in his natural state, can do nothing of himself to his own recovery, without the concurrence of superior aid. If there is any meaning or propriety in Scripture language, we must yield to this. What more could be said, than that we are "dead" in sin? What more incapable of action, than one who is entirely deprived of life?

But lest there should be any remaining exception, the thing is asserted in plain and explicit terms, without any metaphor, by the Apostle John, from our Saviour's own mouth, "No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God: every man, therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me," John, vi. 44, 45. I shall mention only one passage more, in which, under the similitude of a wretched outcast infant, the prophet Ezekiel represents the natural state of Jerusalem: "And as for thy nativity, in the day thou wast born, thy navel was not cut, neither wast thou washed in water to supple thee; thou wast not salted at all, nor swaddled at all. None eye pitied thee, to do any of these unto thee, to have compassion upon thee; but thou wast cast out in the open field, to the loathing of thy person, in the day that thou wast born. And when I passed by thee, and saw thee polluted in thine own blood, I said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, Live; yea, I said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, Live," Ezek. xvi. 4—6. Here all the circumstances are collected, that could signify at once a miserable and weak, wretched and helpless condition; ~~or that~~ could serve to make our deliverance at once a signal instance both of grace and power.

This leads me to observe, that the same truth will receive farther light from those passages of Scripture, in which the real agent in this great change is pointed out, and which celebrate the efficacy of his power. As in the text it is asserted, that "except a man be born again, he cannot enter the kingdom of God;" so in other passages, true believers are said to be "born of God — born from above — born of the Spirit." The power of God, exerted in the renovation of the sinner, is described in language taken from the first formation of the world. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them," Eph. ii. 10. And, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away, behold all things are become new," 2 Cor. v. 17. See the prophecies of the Old Testament respecting the plentiful effusion of the Holy Spirit in the times of the Gospel: they contain a clear description of Divine supernatural influence. Thus the prophet Isaiah: "For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground. I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring; and they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the water-courses," Isa. xliv. 3, 4. To the same purpose the prophet Ezekiel: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh; and I will put my

Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes; and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them," Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27. Let it not seem tedious to any that I have collected so many passages of Scripture on this subject. It is no light thing; and indeed, it is no common thing to believe it from the heart. But let us now affirm it, on Divine testimony, that regeneration is the work of the Holy Ghost.

I would not build this truth upon any other evidence. When we stand in God's room, bear his message, and speak in his name, nothing should be affirmed which cannot be supported by a "Thus saith the Lord." But having done so, I think I may warrantably observe how much the visible state of the world corresponds with the Scripture declarations on this subject. I hope this will be neither unsuitable nor unprofitable, considering what an inward aversion men have to receive and apply them. Do we not daily see many instances of persons, of first-rate understandings and great natural abilities, who yet continue blind to their duty to God, and the salvation of their souls? As they are born, so they continue to shew themselves through their whole lives, "wise to do evil, but to do good they have no knowledge." What proofs do they often give of the power and influence of habits of wickedness over them! How frequently does it happen, that their attachment to sin in general, or to some particular sin, is such as to bear down before it all regard to their own interest, temporal and eternal? While at the same time, persons of unspeakably inferior talents, enlightened by the Spirit and sanctified by the grace of God, shall stand firm against the most dangerous temptations, and escape the pollution that is in the world through lust. This our blessed Lord adores as a part or proof of the sovereignty and unsearchable wisdom of his heavenly Father: "In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight," Luke, x. 21.

Is it not plain, that superior advantages of instruction, though very valuable, are far from being always effectual? Sometimes those who live long under the salutary instruction and edifying example of pious parents and masters, continue, notwithstanding, in an insensible state. Sometimes we see persons sit long under the most enlightening and awakening ministry, with hearts as hard as the nether millstone. The case of the ordinary hearers of the Gospel is indeed often affecting, and leads to serious meditation on the depths of the Divine counsels. Suffer me to bespeak the readers of this class in the following terms: Are not many of you a wonder to yourselves, as well as to one another? Is not your danger often pointed out to you in the clearest manner? Is not your character drawn and distinguished by the most undeniable marks? Are not your duty and interest set before you in such a manner, that it cannot be contradicted, and there is nothing left to reply? And yet, after all, though there may be some weak or temporary resolutions, it is without any real or lasting effect. Doth not this ratify and confirm the following passage of Scripture? "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. So, then, neither is he that planted any thing, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase," 1 Cor. iii. 5—7.

To be absent altogether from the ordinances of God is a dreadful and dangerous thing, for it leads directly to a state of total blindness and undisturbed security. I have often thought, however, that the case of many who continue to give their attendance is much more wonderful. Are there not habitual drunkards often seen in the house of God? Are there not some profane swearers often seen in the house of God? Are there not some who walk in the lust of uncleanness? some who retain, without restitution, unrighteous gain, whom approaching death, the wrath of God, and the fire of hell, cannot terrify? Of such, we may justly say with the Apostle Paul, "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them," 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4.

Let it be farther considered, how much providential warnings are generally despised, even when they are so awful in their nature, and so clear in their meaning, that one would think nothing but an absolute infatuation could prevent their effect. Sinners may keep themselves from hearing the word of God, and from any such reading or conversation as will bring eternity in their view. But He visits them in their families or in their persons, and they cannot fly from those "terrible things in righteousness," by which he pleads his cause from day to day. Are not the young and beautiful soon carried to their graves? Are not the great and noble soon humbled in the dust? Have not sensuality and riot, impurity and lust, slain their victims, and raised up monuments fraught with moral instruction in every age? How long is it ago since Hosea said, "Whoredom, and wine, and new wine, take away the heart?" Hos. iv. 11. And since Solomon said of a harlot, "She hath cast down many wounded, and many strong men have been slain by her. Her house is the way to hell, going down to the chambers of death," Prov. vii. 26, 27. But though uninspired writers have said this as well as he—nay, though it is visible to all—have men become wise? Have they shunned the paths of the destroyer? No: we may justly say of the present times, as the Psalmist David said many ages ago, "This their way is their folly, yet their posterity approve their sayings," Psal. xlix. 13. Nothing, nothing will change them, till the Spirit of God rouse and awaken the conscience, powerfully constrain the will, and effectually renew the heart.

Hence, then, it appears, that the new birth is a "supernatural change;" it is the effect of the power of God; it is the work of the Holy Ghost. I have been at the more pains to establish this truth, because I am persuaded, that until it be truly received, there may be a form, but there can be nothing of the power of godliness. But we must now vindicate it from the objections and abuse to which it may be thought liable. There are many who still harbour in their minds, and sometimes produce in conversation, the objection mentioned by the Apostle Paul: "Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault, for who hath resisted his will?" Rom. ix. 19. This, indeed, is the sum of all the objections that ever were, or ever can be, offered against it: and I make the short answer of the same apostle: "Nay, but, O man! who art thou that repliest against God?" This is but making or imagining an inconsistency between two things, both of which God hath clearly established and inseparably joined in his word. These are, his own power necessary to the change, and our duty in the use of the means; or rather, our sin while continuing at enmity with him, and refusing his mercy.

I make no scruple to acknowledge, that it is impossible for me, nay, I find no difficulty in supposing that it is impossible for any finite mind to point out the bounds between the "dependence" and "activity" of the creature. But though we must ever remember, that it is He alone "who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean," yet we know also, that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." We know that God will be "just when he speaketh, and clear when he judgeth:" that he rejects, with disdain, the imputation of being the author of sin. "Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted of evil, neither tempteth he any man," James, i. 13. For our great assurance of this, he hath condescended to confirm it by his oath: "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way, and live: turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" Ezekiel, xxxiii. 11. The connection between this and the former truth appears plainly in the following passage:—"Ye will not come unto me, that ye might have life," John, v. 40.

Perhaps, also, there are some who abuse this doctrine to sloth and negligence. At least, they may pretend this as an excuse or palliation of their contempt of religion. But is it not an inference directly contrary to what the Scripture teaches us, much more justly, to draw from the same truth, namely, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God that worketh in you to will and to do of his good pleasure," Phil. ii. 12, 13. The former inference would be just in the case of devils, who, having received their sentence, can only now "believe and tremble:" but it would be altogether unjust, and a dreadful contempt of mercy, in those to whom the offer of salvation by grace is addressed. What is now transacting in the ministry of the gospel, shall contribute at last to stop every mouth, and put this criminal excuse to eternal silence. Suppose the sinner, at the judgment-seat, to offer this defence for himself: "I was altogether under the power of corruption; it was impossible for me to do any thing of myself." Is it not natural to reply, "Where learned you this?" From the Holy Scriptures. "And did not the same Scriptures also tell you, Him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out. Wherefore he is able to save to the uttermost all that come to God through him. Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved?" But I could not reconcile one Scripture to another. "And was that any way wonderful? or can it possibly justify your rebellion against the plainest commands, that you were not able fully to comprehend what is said of the absolute dominion and sovereignty of God?"

Let us, therefore, settle it in our minds, that, though we are of ourselves utterly unable to produce a change in our hearts, "nothing is impossible with God." He first made them, and he is able to reform them. On a conviction of our own inability, one would think we should but the more humbly and the more earnestly apply to Him who is all-sufficient in power and grace. The deplorable, and naturally helpless state of sinners, doth not hinder exhortations to them in Scripture; and, therefore, takes not away their obligation to duty. See an address, where the strongest metaphors are retained, the exhortation given in these very terms, and the foundation of the duty plainly pointed out: "Wherefore he saith, Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light," Eph. v. 14. From which it is very plain, that the moral inability, under which sinners now lie, as a consequence of the fall, is not of such a nature as to take away the guilt of sin, the propriety of exhortations to duty, or the necessity of endeavours after recovery.

But what shall we say? Alas! the very subject we are now speaking of affords a new proof of the blindness, prejudice, and obstinacy of sinners. They are self-condemned; for they do not act the same part in similar cases. The affairs of the present life are not managed in so preposterous a manner. He that ploughs his ground, and throws in his seed, cannot so much as unite one grain to the clod; nay, he is not able to conceive how it is done. He cannot carry on, nay, he cannot so much as begin one single step of this wonderful process toward the subsequent crop; the mortification of the seed, the resurrection of the blade, and gradual increase, till it come to perfect maturity. Is it, therefore, reasonable, that he should say, I, for my part, can do nothing? It is, first and last, an effect of Divine power and energy. And God can as easily raise a crop without sowing as with it, in a single instant, and in any place, as in a long time, by the mutual influence of soil and season: I will therefore spare myself the hardship of toil and labour, and wait with patience, till I see what he will be pleased to send. Would this be madness? Would it be universally reputed so? And would it not be equal madness to turn the grace of God into licentiousness? Believe it, the warning is equally reasonable and equally necessary, in spiritual as in temporal things: "Be not deceived, God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap: for he that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting," Gal. vi. 7, 8.

CHAPTER II.

IN WHICH IS SHEWN WHEREIN THE CHANGE DOTH PROPERLY AND DIRECTLY CONSIST, AND WHAT ARE ITS PRINCIPAL EVIDENCES AND FRUITS.

SECT. I.—Wherein the change in regeneration doth properly and directly consist.

I HAVE hitherto, by general remarks, endeavoured to caution the reader against taking up with erroneous and defective views of the nature of religion. We now proceed a step farther: and I would willingly point out, in as distinct a manner as I am able, what is the change which is wrought in all, without exception, who are the real children of God, by whatever means it is brought about: what it is in the temper and disposition, in the life and practice, which constitutes the difference between one who "is," and one who is "not born again." The different steps by which this change may be effected in the sovereign providence of God, and the different degrees of perfection at which it may arrive, I purposely omit here, and reserve as the subject of a distinct head of discourse.

That we may enter on the subject with the greater perspicuity and simplicity, it will be proper to begin with observing, that the design and purpose of this change is, to repair the loss which man sustained by the fall. Man, at his first creation, was made after the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, and enjoyed uninterrupted fellowship and communion with him. He was not only subservient to the Divine glory, by a natural and necessary subjection to the Divine dominion, which all creatures are, have been, and ever will be, but by choice and inclination, his duty and delight being invariably the same. By the fall he became not only obnoxious to the Divine displeasure, by a single act of transgression, but disobedient to the Divine will in his habitual and prevailing inclination. This is the character given not of one man only, but of the human race: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually," Gen. vi. 5.

He became, at the same time, not only unworthy of, but wholly disinclined to, communion with God, and habitually disposed to prefer the creature before the Creator, who is "God blessed for evermore." In regeneration, therefore, the sinner must be restored to the image of God, which, in a created nature, is but another expression for obedience to his will. He must also be restored to the exercise of love to him, and find his happiness and comfort in him. His habitual temper, his prevailing disposition, or that which hath the ascendency, must be the same that was perfect and without mixture, before the fall, and shall be made equally, or perhaps more perfect, in heaven after death.

As the change must be entire and universal, corresponding to the corruption of the whole man, it is not unusual to say, it may be fully comprehended in the three following things—giving a new direction to the understanding, the will, and the affections. And, no doubt, with respect to every one of these, there is a remarkable and sensible change. But as the understanding is a natural faculty, which becomes good or evil just as it is applied or employed, it would be scarce possible to illustrate the change in it without introducing, at the same time, a view of the disposition and tendency of the heart and affections. As, therefore, the change is properly of a moral or spiritual nature, it seems to me properly and directly to consist in these two things: 1. That our supreme and chief end be to serve and glorify God, and that every other aim be subordinate to this. 2. That the soul rest in God as its chief happiness, and habitually prefer his favour to every other enjoyment. These two particulars I shall now endeavour to illustrate a little, in the order in which I have named them.

1. Our supreme and chief end must be to serve and glorify God, and every other aim must be subordinate to this.

All things were originally made, and are daily preserved for—nay, they shall certainly in the issue tend to—the glory of God; that is, the exercise and illustration of Divine perfection. With this great end of creation, the inclination and will of every intelligent creature ought to coincide. It is, according to Scripture and reason, the first duty of man to "give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name." This, I know, the world that lieth in wickedness can neither understand nor approve. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned," 1 Cor. ii. 14. The truth is, we ought not to be surprised to find it so, for in this the sin of man originally consisted, and in this the nature of all sin, as such, doth still consist, namely, withdrawing the allegiance due to God, and refusing subjection to his will. The language of every unrenewed heart, and the language of every sinner's practice is, "Our lips are our own, who is lord over us?" But he that is renewed and born again, hath seen his own entire dependence upon God, hath seen his Maker's right of dominion, and the obligation upon all his creatures to be in every respect subservient to his glory, and without reserve submissive to his will. He hath seen this to be most "fit" and "reasonable," because of the absolute perfection and infinite excellence of the Divine nature. He is convinced that all preferring of our will to that of God, is a criminal usurpation by the creature, of the inalienable rights of the great Creator and sovereign Proprietor of all.

Regeneration, then, is communicating this new principle, and giving it such force as that it may obtain and preserve the ascendency, and habitually govern the will. Every one may easily see the different operation and effects of this principle and its opposite, by the different carriage and behaviour of men in the world. The unrenewed man seeks his own happiness immediately and ultimately: it is to please himself, that he constantly aims. This is the cause, the uniform cause, of his preferring one action to another. This determines his choice of employment, enjoyments, and companions. His religious actions are not chosen, but submitted to, through fear of worse. He considers religion as a restraint, and the Divine law as hard and severe. So that a short and summary description may be given of man in his natural state—that he hath forgotten his subjection, that God is dethroned, and self honoured, loved, and served in his room.

This account will appear to be just, from every view given us in Scripture of our state and character, before or after conversion. It appears very clearly, from the first condition required by our Saviour of his disciples, namely, self-denial: "Then said Jesus to his disciples, if any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me," Matt. xvi. 24. All those who are brought back to a sense of their duty and obligation as creatures, are ready to say, not with their tongues only, but with their hearts, "Thou art worthy to receive glory, and honour, and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created," Rev. iv. 11. It ought to be attended to, what is the import of this, when spoken from conviction. They not only consider God as being most great, and therefore to be feared; but as infinitely holy, as absolutely perfect, and therefore to be loved and served. They esteem all his commands concerning all things to be right. Their own remaining corruption is known, felt, and confessed to be wrong. This law in their members, warring against the law of God in their minds, is often deeply lamented, and, by the grace of God, strenuously and habitually resisted.

Perhaps the attentive reader may have observed, that I have still kept out of view our own great interest in the service of God. The reason is, there is certainly, in every renewed heart, a sense of duty, independent of interest. Were this not the case, even supposing a desire of reward, or fear of punishment, should dispose to obedience, it would plainly be only a change of life, and no change of heart. At the same time, as it did not arise from any inward principle, it would be neither uniform nor lasting. It is beyond all question, indeed, that our true interest is inseparable from our duty, so that self-seeking is self-losing; but still a sense of duty must have the precedency, otherwise it changes its nature, and is, properly speaking, no duty at all.

To honour God in the heart, then, and to serve him in the life, is the first and highest desire of him that is born again. This is not, and cannot be the case, with any in a natural state. But, before we proceed to the other particular implied in this change, it will not be improper to make an observation, which I hope will have the greater weight, when the foundation of it is fresh in the reader's mind. Hence may be plainly seen the reason why profane and worldly men have such a tendency to self-righteousness, while the truly pious are filled with an abhorrence of that soul-destroying falsehood. This, I dare say, appears strange to many, as I confess it hath often done to me, before I had thought fully upon the subject: that those who evidently are none of the strictest in point of morals, and have least of that kind to boast of, should yet be the most professed admirers and defenders of the doctrine of justification by works, and despisers of the doctrine of the grace of God. But the solution is easy and natural. Worldly men have no just sense of their natural and inalienable obligation to glorify God in their thoughts, words, and actions, and therefore all that they do in religion, they look upon as a meritorious service, and think that certainly something is due to them on that account. They think it strange, if they have walked soberly, regularly, and decently, especially if they have been strict and punctual in the forms of Divine worship, that God should not be obliged (pardon the expression) to reward them according to their works. It is a hard service to them, they do it only that they may be rewarded, or at least not suffer for the neglect of it, and therefore cannot but insist upon the merit of it.

On the other hand, those who are born of God, are sensible that it is the duty of every rational creature to love God, with all his heart, and to consecrate all his powers and faculties to his Maker's service. They are convinced that, whoever should do so, without sin, would do only what is just and equal, and have no plea of merit to advance. But when they consider how many sins still cleave to them, how far short they come of their duty in every instance, they ask for mercy, and not for reward, and are ready to say with the Psalmist David, "If thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand? but there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared," Psa. cxxx. 3, 4. To sum up this reasoning in a few words. The reluctant obedience which some pay to the Divine law, is considered as a debt charged upon God; whereas real obedience is considered as a debt due to God. And therefore it must always hold, that the very imperfection of an obedience itself increases our disposition to overvalue and rest our dependence upon it.

Sect. II.—The second part of this change.

The next thing implied in a saving change is, that the soul rests in God as its chief happiness, and habitually prefers his favour to every other enjoyment. On this branch of the subject I would beg the reader to observe, not only the meaning and substance of the proposition, but the order in which it is placed. There must be first a devotedness of mind to God, and a supreme leading concern for his honour and glory. He must be, if I may so speak, again restored to his original right, his dominion and throne, while the creature is reduced to its obedience and subjection. In consequence of this, there is an unfeigned acquiescence in God, as the source of comfort, and a high esteem of his favour as better than life. This does not go before, nay, is hardly distinct or separated from, a sense of duty, but is founded upon it, and grows out of it. When a holy soul has seen the infinite excellence and glory of the true God, loves him supremely, and is devoted to him entirely, he also delights in him superlatively.

Such a person is fully convinced that those, and those alone are happy, whose God is the Lord, and that those who are afar off from him shall certainly perish. In a natural state, as the sure consequence of sin, the transgressor flies from God with a dread and horror of his presence. But the renewed soul returns to him with desire, and feels an uneasiness and want, that cannot be supplied but by the intimation of pardon, and sense of Divine love. The warmth and fervour of devout affection is expressed in the strongest terms in Scripture: "As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God, when shall I come and appear before God?" Psal. xlii. 1, 2. "Because thy loving-kindness is better than life, my lips shall praise thee. Thus will I bless thee while I live, I will lift up my hands in thy name, my soul shall be satisfied as with marrow and fatness, and my mouth shall praise thee with joyful lips," Psal. lxiii. 3—5.

It is necessary that serving and delighting in God should be joined together on a double account. Their influence on one another is reciprocal. It is not easy to distinguish a conscientious study to serve and glorify God, from a slavish obedience through fear of Divine power, but by its being inseparably connected with a delight in God, as the choice of the heart, and centre of the affections. On the other hand, it is hard to distinguish cleaving to God as our portion and happiness, from an interested mercenary bargain in religion, except by its being preceded by, founded upon, nay, even resolved into, a sense of the supreme honour due to God for his infinite excellence. This reasonable service will then be attended with an unspeakable sweetness and complacency, and the all-sufficiency of God will be an unshaken security for the happiness and peace of those who put their trust in him.

We may often observe these two dispositions jointly exerting themselves, and mutually strengthening one another, in the language and exercises of the saints, in Scripture. With what fervour of spirit, and with what inimitable force and beauty of style, do we find the Psalmist David expressing himself in both views. Sometimes he makes a full surrender of himself and his all to the Divine service and disposal; at other times his soul "makes her boast in God," and he exults in his happiness and security under the Divine protection: "O my soul, thou hast said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord," Psal. xvi. 2. "The Lord is the portion of mine inheritance, and of my cup; thou maintainest my lot; the lines are fallen to me in pleasant places, yea, I have a goodly heritage," ver. 5, 6.

These two things are, indeed, often so intimately united, that we are at a loss to know whether we should interpret the language of the sacred writers as a profession of duty or an expression of delight, as in the following words: "I will sing unto the Lord as long as I live, I will sing praise unto my God while I have my being. My meditation of him shall be sweet, I will be glad in the Lord," Psal. civ. 33, 34. How deeply the Psalmist was penetrated with a sense of the honour and service due to God, may be particularly seen in some of those animated passages in which his enlarged heart calls upon every creature to join in the work of praise: "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening to the voice of his word. Bless ye the Lord, all ye his hosts, ye ministers of his that do his pleasure. Bless the Lord all his works, in all places of his dominion. Bless the Lord, O my soul," Psa. ciii. 20—22.

It is easy to see how this distinguishes the natural from the new-born soul; nay, it is easy to see how this distinguishes the man who is renewed in the spirit of his mind, from all others, however various their characters, however different or opposite their pursuits. The design of man's creation is expressed in the Assembly's Shorter Catechism, in a way that can scarcely be altered for the better: it was, "that he might glorify God, and enjoy him for ever." As he departed from his duty by sin, so also, at the same time, from his happiness. As he refused to do the will of God, so he no more sought his favour, but placed his comfort and happiness in the creature "more than in the Creator, who is God blessed for ever." All unrenewed persons, in one shape or another, place their supreme happiness in something that is not God. In this one circumstance they all agree, though the different forms which the world puts on to solicit their affection, the different degrees in which they prosecute it, and the different ways in which they apply or abuse it, are so very many, that it is impossible to enumerate or describe them. Though there is but one God, the idols of the nations are innumerable. There is but one way to peace, and if that is neglected, the unsatisfactory nature of all created enjoyments makes men fly from one earthly comfort to another, till they feel, by late experience, the vanity of them all. Their state is justly described by the wise man when he says, "Lo, this only have I found, that God made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions," Eccles. vii. 29.

It may not be improper, here, just to hint at a few of the principal pursuits by which the characters of men are diversified, their hearts and cares divided, and the "one thing needful" is forgotten and disregarded. Some there are who yield themselves up to the unrestrained indulgence of pleasure. Sensual appetite and passion carry them on with unbridled fury. The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, possess their affections; and their prevailing desire is to gratify these appetites, as far as their situation and circumstances enable them, or the rival pursuits of others will permit them. This, which is usually the first attempt of unsanctified and ungoverned youth, is well described by the wise man, in the following strong caution against it: "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, and let thine heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thy heart, and in the sight of thine eyes: but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment," Eccles. xi. 9. This is the path of the abandoned and heaven-daring profligate, who casts off all fear of God, who bursts asunder every bond, who "draws iniquity with cords of vanity, and sin as it were with a cart-rope."

Again, there are some whose hearts are set upon present gain. Instead of making that sober and moderate use of this world and its enjoyments, which becometh mortal creatures, they look upon it as their home. Instead of considering it only as a mean to a higher end, they have it as their chief or principal view, to secure or enlarge their possession of it. These "say to the gold, Thou art my refuge; and to the fine gold, Thou art my confidence." They think their "houses will endure for ever, and their dwelling-places to all generations." This is often the sin of riper years; and, that the brutish folly of sinners may more eminently shew itself, it is often the reproach and scandal of old age, when its absurdity is most sensible and apparent. What doth it signify how much men of this character despise the levity of youth, or hate the filthy receptacles of sensuality and lust, while their affections are supremely set upon the present world, while "they bless the covetous, whom the Lord abhorreth?"

It is often sufficient to raise in every serious person a mixture of compassion and indignation, to hear those with whom poverty is the only crime, openly pleading for, and boasting of, their attachment to the world, or treating with a smile of contempt those who tell them, from the word of God, that it is vain. Though nothing is more frequently confirmed by experience, it is usual to consider this as only pulpit declamation, a part of our business and profession, but containing a maxim that cannot be applied to common life. Let all such be informed, whether they will hear it or not, that, however regular and abstemious they may be as to all sensual indulgence, however diligent, eager, and successful in trade, "except they be born again, they cannot see the kingdom of God." And, that they may not deceive themselves, but know in part at least wherein this change consisteth, let them peruse and ponder the following passage of the Apostle John: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world: if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him," 1 John, ii. 15.

Once more. There are some who walk in the path of ambition. Pride and vain-glory is the idol at whose shrine they bow. These, indeed, may be divided into very different classes. Pride, which may be called the master-passion of the human frame, takes in the most extensive and universal range. There is scarcely any state in which it is not able to exert itself, scarcely any circumstance which it is not able to convert into the means of its own gratification. All natural advantages which men enjoy over others, whether in respect of body or mind; all the additional trappings of society, namely, wealth, station, and office; all acquired advantages, intellectual, or even moral, become the fuel of pride. As some endeavour, by extraordinary actions, to spread their fame in public life, others, though in a narrower sphere, are under the habitual government of the same desire. While great men are taking cities, and destroying kingdoms, to get themselves a name, others of meaner rank are vying with one another in dress, furniture, and equipage, or such inferior arts as they have been able to attain. Nay, those who never did any thing that could merit praise, too often shew themselves under the government of the most hateful and detestable kind of ambition, by a rancorous malice and envy against such as excel or outshine them. We may go a step farther, and say there is great reason to believe, that, in some, the cultivation of their minds, long and assiduous application to study, zealous and successful endeavours to promote the public good, ought to be ascribed to no other source, to no higher motive.

I thought I could not fall upon any way to illustrate this part of my subject, which would make it more intelligible than to give this short view of the characters and pursuits of the men of the world; and then to observe, that the change in regeneration doth properly consist in a strong inward conviction of the vanity of worldly enjoyments of every kind; and a persuasion, that the favour and enjoyment of God is infinitely superior to them all. Whatever other differences there may be, this will be found in every child of God, from the highest to the lowest, from the richest to the poorest, from the wisest to the most ignorant, and from the oldest to the youngest. Every such one will be able to say with the Psalmist, "There be many that say, Who will shew us any good? Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us. Thou hast put gladness in my heart, more than in the time that their corn and their wine increased. I will both lay me down in peace, and sleep, for thou, Lord, only makest me dwell in safety," Psa. iv. 6—8.

I shall afterwards have occasion more fully to explain the comparative influence of this desire; but, before I conclude this section, must make the two following remarks: 1. That the favour of God must appear to the believer as absolutely necessary to his comfort. 2. As full and sufficient for that purpose.

1. He that is born again, considers the favour of God as absolutely necessary to his comfort. He sees the emptiness and inherent vanity of all things else. Even when the world smiles, even when things succeed with him to his wish, he will not rest satisfied with any, or all temporal mercies. He will, above all, desire an interest in that love which God beareth to his "chosen people;" a right by promise or covenant to the use of present comforts, and the favour and protection of his special providence. How contrary this to the temper of many, who have a name to live, while they are dead! If the world smiles, they follow it with eagerness, and embrace it with complacency, while they are cold and indifferent in their desires towards God. Perhaps when they are distressed with outward calamities, when experience constrains them to confess the vanity of the creature, they cry to God for relief. But when ease and prosperity return, they soon forget his works, are well pleased with their condition, and neither grieve for his absence, nor are afraid of his anger. This shews plainly, that whatever occasional symptoms they may discover, they are supremely and habitually possessed by a love of the world, and desire of sensual gratification. In opposition to this, every real Christian sees the favour of God to be so absolutely necessary, that he cannot be without it. He sees it to be more necessary than riches, honours, or pleasures, nay, than health, or even life itself; all which he values chiefly as they are the fruits of the Divine bounty, as tokens of Divine love, and as they afford him an opportunity of promoting the Divine glory. He is ready to say with the Psalmist, "Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire besides thee: my flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever," Psa. lxxiii. 25, 26.

2. He that is born again, considers the favour of God as full and sufficient for his

comfort and happiness. That is to say, he is habitually satisfied with this as his portion, whether there be abundance or straitness as to outward provision. He counts the favour of God as absolutely necessary, but nothing else is considered as such. No earthly enjoyments can satisfy him without God's favour; but this will satisfy him, be his outward condition what it will. I am far from meaning to affirm, that every good man is free from the least rising murmur, the least impatient or rebellious thought. If it were so with any man, he would be perfect in holiness; but I mean to signify, that this is his habitual and prevailing temper. He is inwardly convinced, that those alone are happy; and that they are, and shall be, completely happy, who are reconciled to God, and the objects of his special love. His own remaining attachment to present things, and immoderate sorrow under outward calamity, he sincerely laments as his weakness, and humbly confesses as his sin. He endeavours to supply the void left by every earthly comfort, when it is withdrawn, by the fulness and all-sufficiency of God. He possesses, in some measure, and breathes after more and more of the temper expressed in the two following passages of Scripture: " Although my house be not so with God, yet he hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things, and sure; for this is all my salvation, and all my desire," 2 Sam. xxiii. 5. " Although the fig-tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines; the labour of the olive shall fail, and the field shall yield no meat; the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls; yet will I rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation," Hab. iii. 17, 18.

Thus I have endeavoured to point out wherein the change in regeneration doth immediately and properly consist. It is just the recovery of the moral image of God upon the heart; that is to say, to love him supremely, and serve him ultimately, as our highest end; and to delight in him superlatively, as our chief good. This recovery, however, is but begun on earth. It is gradually improved in the progress of sanctification, and shall be fully completed at the resurrection of the just. The sum of the moral law is, to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and soul, and strength, and mind. This is the duty of every rational creature; and, in order to obey it perfectly, no part of our inward affection or actual service ought to be, at any time, or in the least degree, misapplied. This is the case with no mere man, while he continues in the body. But regeneration consists in the principle being implanted, obtaining the ascendency, and habitually prevailing over its opposite. Even in those who are born again, there will still be many struggles between the " law of sin in their members," and the " law of God in their minds." This we find deeply lamented by the Apostle Paul: " O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Rom. vii. 24. It ought to give unspeakable consolation to the Christian, when he reflects, that the seed which is planted by Divine grace, shall be preserved by Divine power. A gracious God will neither suffer it to be smothered by contending weeds, nor destroyed by the inclemency of this tempestuous climate, but it shall be transplanted into the milder regions of peace and serenity above.

SECT. III. — The effects of regeneration; with some of the principal evidences of its sincerity.

In the further prosecution of this head, I proposed to mention some of the principal evidences and fruits of a saving change. These, no doubt, it were easy, with sufficient propriety, greatly to extend and enlarge, because they include all the marks and signs of real religion, suited to every character and every situation in which a Christian can be placed. The heart being renewed, the life will of necessity be reformed, and holiness in all manner of conversation, including the duties of piety towards God, and justice and charity towards men, will be its native and genuine effect. But this would be too wide and general a field. I find most writers on this subject take particular notice of the new views and apprehensions which the regenerate person hath of himself, and every other thing or person to which he stands related. I shall, therefore, very shortly observe, he who is born again, discovers his new nature and life by new apprehensions of God, of himself, of the world, of eternity, of Jesus Christ the Saviour of sinners, and of all the ordinances of his appointment.

The regenerate person has new views of God, both in respect of greatness and goodness. He really and inwardly believes the being, presence, power, and providence of God, which he in a great measure disbelieved before. Whereas, formerly, even what he did believe of God was seldom in his thoughts; now it is almost impossible for him to look upon any thing, or person, or event, without considering its relation to God. O what "terrible majesty" does his sanctified understanding perceive in this Being of beings, compared to the times of his former blindness! What a lustre and glory does the opened eye see in all the Divine perfections! Above all, what a rapturous and astonishing view has he of the Divine goodness and love! Wicked men, governed by self-love, are therefore insensible of obligations. Inordinate in their desires, they are never satisfied with their possessions: whereas the child of God discovers and confesses the infinite goodness of his Creator in all his mercies, of the least of which he is not worthy.

He hath quite new apprehensions of himself, his own character and state. Before, he thought himself his own master, and looked upon every religious law as a hard and tyrannical restraint; but now, he sees that he belongs to God; he now remembers his Creator, confesses his obligations, and mourns for his transgressions. A converted sinner often admires and stands astonished at his own former conduct. He wonders at the boldness of a poor, guilty, helpless rebel, perhaps cursing and blaspheming, perhaps rioting in sensuality and lust. He wonders that the power of God did not arrest him in his course, and, by some signal stroke, make him a standing monument of righteous indignation. He trembles to think of his former state, and it excites in him a deep and lively acknowledgment of the riches of Divine grace. How great a sense of this does the Apostle Paul often express in his own case; "who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious." "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief." 1 Tim. i. 13, 15.

The above is often connected with, and increased by, his views of the world and of worldly men. The charm is now broken; the false colours are now taken off from the world and all its enjoyments. How ardently did he love them once! how eagerly did he prosecute them! and how rich did he esteem them! He envied every one who possessed them, and thought that none such could fail of being completely happy. But now he can never separate the idea of riches from temptation, and often considers the dreadful change of state in those who are carried about in pomp and grandeur on earth; who are clothed in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day; but are, in a little time, tormented in hell-fire. Formerly, he valued persons by their station, by their wealth, by their spirit and genius, or other natural qualifications. But now, a Christian in a cottage, appears more honourable and more amiable than an unbeliever in a palace. Now, his heart is joined to every servant of Christ, though despised in the world, though emaciated by sickness, though deformed with old age; nay, though loathsome and sordid through penury and want. He sees the beauty of these excellent ones of the earth, under all their present disadvantages, and in them is all his delight. With regard to persons of an opposite character, the penitent often recollects, with a bleeding heart, his fondness for, and attachment to, sinful companions; and his kindness to them is converted into a yearning tenderness and compassion for their miserable state.

Farther, the regenerate person has new apprehensions of eternity. Formerly, the shadows and vanities of time so engrossed his thoughts, so filled and occupied his sight, that eternity was seldom at all, and never fully, in view. But now, it is frequently and strongly upon his mind. Now it, as it were, joins itself with, and points out its own relation to, every subject, and its concern in every pursuit. Now, it is present as the object of faith, to correct the false representations of sense, and to oppose the unjust claim of earthly and momentary gratifications. Formerly, things unseen were counted in a manner precarious and fabulous, of small moment in any determination: but now, there is such a discovery of the great realities of another world, as weighs down all created things, and makes them feel as a feather in the balance.

Let us here stand still, and pause a little. Let me beseech every reader to ponder this reflection, which I cannot pass. Oh! what concern have we all in an everlasting, endless eternity! O subject without bounds! Who is able to do it justice in words? Who is able to reach it, even in thought? Happiness, that shall continue through everlasting ages; misery, anguish, torment, that shall never have an end! Are we all, without exception, to be so divided at last? Yes; the great Judge shall separate the righteous from the wicked, and shall set the one on his right hand, and the other on his left. Shall then companions on earth, shall fellow-citizens, and fellow-soldiers, the dearest friends and the nearest relations, be parted asunder, and take a long, long, eternal farewell? O the strong deceit and illusion of sin, that is able to hide eternity from dying men! O the inconceivable blindness of those who are unmindful of a future state, while they inhabit these tabernacles of clay, which are so often tottering, which are daily wasting, and shall so soon fall in pieces, and crumble into dust! How is it possible we should forget, that in a little time "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ!"

The regenerate person has also new views of Jesus Christ, the great and only Saviour of sinners. Before, "he was without form or comeliness, or any beauty, that he should desire him." Before, (as is, alas! the case with very many,) all the truths, relating to the person, character, and office of a Mediator, were hated as absurdities, or despised as enthusiasm. They were nick-named, nonsense, cant, and unintelligible stuff. Or, if decency forbad this, they were altogether cold and without relish. But now, the name of a Saviour is "precious—even as ointment poured forth," Cant. i. 3. The strongest language is too weak to express his gratitude, or breathe out his love. "He is white and ruddy, the chief among ten thousand; yea, he is altogether lovely," Cant. v. 10, 16. How great is the difference between the self-righteous formalist and the humbled penitent! The one, trusting in himself that he is righteous, knows little of the value of a Saviour: the other, deeply penetrated with a sense of guilt, and strongly conscious of absolute weakness, "counts all things but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord; and desires to be found in him, not having his own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness that is of God by faith," Phil. iii. 8, 9.

Again, the regenerate person has new views of the ordinances of Christ's appointment. They were formerly his burden, now they are his delight. Before, the Sabbath wore, as it were, a sable garb, and an offensive gloom. It was looked upon as a season of confinement and restraint. He was ready to say, "What a weariness is it! when will the Sabbath be over, and the new moon, that we may set forth corn, and sell wheat?" But now he calls it a delight, the "holy of the Lord, and honourable." Now, he thirsts after the water of life, esteems, loves, and desires the word of God. He now readily joins the holy Psalmist in all those fervent expressions, to be found in his writings, of affection to the truths and ordinances of God: "O how I love thy law! it is my meditation all the day," Psal. cxix. 97. "The law of thy mouth is better to me than thousands of gold and silver," Psal. cxix. 72. "My soul thirsteth for thee; my flesh longeth for thee, in a dry and thirsty land, where no water is: To see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen it in the sanctuary," Psal. lxiii. 1, 2. "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord; our feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem!" Psal. cxxii. 1, 2.

Suffer me now to conclude this general account of the spirit and temper of the regenerate, with a few particular characters, by which they will commonly be distinguished.

1. The new nature will discover itself by great humility. There is no disposition more the object of Divine abhorrence and detestation than pride; nor, consequently, any more amiable and necessary than humility. We are told, that "God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble," James, iv. 6. To the same purpose the Prophet Isaiah, "For thus saith the high and lofty One, that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy, I dwell in the high and holy place; with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones," Isaiah, lvii. 15. Pride was the sin by which the angels fell from their glory and happiness. It appears to have been the chief ingredient in the first sin of man; and, in general, the leading part of a sinful character. Before there can be any saving change, before there can be any esteem or relish of the gospel of the grace of God, there must be a deep humility of mind, and a thorough conviction of guilt and wretchedness. This must still continue, and have a constant and visible effect upon the believer's temper and carriage. The truth is, the way in which a sinner's peace is made with God, the ground on which his hope and comfort is founded, and the means of his improvement in the spiritual life, all conspire in making him humble. "Where is boasting? It is excluded. No flesh is permitted to glory" in the Divine presence. Every sincere penitent, every real believer, every profiting disciple of Christ, learns the emptiness of the creature, the fulness, sovereignty, power, wisdom, and grace of the Creator and Redeemer, from all that he hears, and from all all that he feels.

In his former state, either his ignorance of God, or his wrong views of God and of himself, made him set a high value upon his own interest, and think he had a high claim to happiness, and success of every kind. This made him repine at the course of Providence, and very hardly allow that justice was done him when his attempts were defeated, or his desires disappointed. What sullen impatience do many shew under the hand of God! What corroding envy possesses their minds when they take a view of the (perhaps mistaken) happiness of others! But he that is born again is deeply sensible that he deserves nothing at the hand of God. His habitual sentiments and language are the same with what we find in Scripture so frequent with the saints: "I am not worthy of the least of all the mercies, and of all the truth, which thou hast shewn unto thy servant," Gen. xxxii. 10. "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not," Lam. iii. 22. "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given," Eph. iii. 8. Whereas, formerly, he was apt to view his own character with much complacence, and to have high thoughts of the dignity of human virtue, now he hath changed the stern pride of philosophy, for the self-denial and meekness of the gospel. He has such views of the glory and majesty of God, of the purity of his law, and of the holiness of his nature, that he sinks, as it were, into nothing in his own sight, and knows not how to throw himself into a posture low enough in the Divine presence. Agreeably to this, we have a striking picture, drawn by our Saviour in the parable of the Pharisee and Publican, of true penitence, particularly as standing in opposition to self-sufficiency and pride: "The Pharisee stood, and prayed thus with himself: God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess. And the Publican, standing afar off, would not lift so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me, a sinner," Luke, xviii. 11—13.

Farther, true religion makes a man humble towards his fellow-creatures, as well as toward God. The one, indeed, is the certain and necessary effect of the other. Every thing which one man can enjoy in preference to another, and which ordinarily becomes the fuel of pride, is the gift of God, and therefore there is no room left to glory. What distinction can any man enjoy above another, but it must be of one of these two kinds, worldly advantages, or spiritual gifts? Now, worldly advantages are of no such value, in the eye of a real Christian, as to be matter of boasting. All swelling on this account is effectually restrained by true religion: that which brings eternity in view, makes all temporal things of wonderfully little value, to have or to lose. And even still less will a good man glory in his advantages over others, of a spiritual kind. Pride can never be so greatly misplaced, as when it shews itself here. The Christian will say to himself in the words of the Apostle Paul, " For who maketh thee to differ from another? and what hast thou, that thou didst not receive? Now, if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?" 1 Cor. iv. 7.

I cannot help also observing here, that every true convert is naturally led to consider himself as the chief of sinners, and every real Christian to reckon that others are preferable to him in holiness and spiritual attainments. This is often taken notice of by religious writers, in a perfect consistency both with Scripture and experience. We see this was the case with the Apostle Paul, that eminently holy, faithful, and active minister of Jesus Christ. He expressly styles himself the " chief of sinners;" and says, " Howbeit, for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first," or in me as a capital and leading instance, " Jesus Christ might shew forth all long-suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting," 1 Tim. i. 16. And, elsewhere, to the same purpose, with a view to his ministerial labours: " For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God; but, by the grace of God, I am what I am, and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain, but I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me," 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10. This is easy to be accounted for. Every man must have a far more clear discovery and conviction of his own sins, in their heinous nature and aggravating circumstances, than of those of any other, as well as a greater insight into the remaining corruption of his own heart. Hence it is natural for him to conclude, that none have been so deeply indebted as himself to the riches of Divine grace, for pardon and recovery.

From every view we can take of the matter, therefore, it is plain that the regenerate person must be, according to the strong and beautiful language of the Holy Scripture, " clothed with humility." He must be very humble: he must be humble in every respect; he must be inwardly, habitually, constantly, universally humble. I know no disposition better fitted either to determine our character in general, or to decide when the Christian is discharging any duty in a proper manner. It is also a good touchstone by which to try a profession, or apparent zeal for religion. I am sensible it is a duty openly to profess Christ before men, and that he has pronounced a dreadful threatening against those who shall meanly deny him: " Whosoever shall be ashamed of me, or of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels," Mark, viii. 38. There are many of the duties of a Christian which require a firm resolution, a boldness and fortitude of mind; yet even this should be accompanied with humility. Unnecessary ostentation is always a suspicious sign. A Christian should be constrained, in all such cases, by a sense of duty, and enter upon his work with a diffidence of himself, and reliance on Divine strength.

Let not the reader think this part of the subject tedious, or extended beyond its due bounds; let him rather enter on a deep and careful search into his own heart, and see how it stands with himself in this particular. There is often a counterfeit humility. A proud and vain-glorious carriage is odious to man as well as to God. Pride in one man, is always in open hostility against pride in another; nay, pride, when discovered, effectually defeats its own purpose. Not only is a man, who is vain of nothing, justly and universally contemptible, but in all cases, as Solomon says, " for a man to search his own glory, is not glory." Even the most eminent abilities, the most amiable qualifications, and the most laudable actions, are greatly sullied by an apparent vanity and thirst of praise. It is hardly possible to bring others to acknowledge that man's worth who asserts it with his own tongue, and absolves the world by paying tribute to himself. Hence there is a remarkable observation of a foreign writer of eminent piety and learning, to this purpose, That a worldly principle, when it is attended with sound judgment, and in its highest perfection, does homage to religion, by imitating its effects. And, indeed, what is all politeness of carriage, but a sort of hypocritical humility, and an empty profession of that deference to the judgment and kindness to the persons of others, which a true Christian hath implanted in his heart?

How self-deceiving is pride! How many are there, even of those who have a form of godliness, who are wrapt up in themselves, who would have all men to esteem them, who would have their opinions to prevail, and their measures to take place, in every matter of the smallest consequence, and are never satisfied but when this is the case? Of this they are often quite insensible themselves, when every one about them perceives it without the least difficulty or uncertainty. Nay, is it not very surprising, and very lamentable, that there is still so much pride to be found even in good men, which betrays itself by many evidences—impatience of contradiction in their sentiments, excessive grief, or immoderate resentment when their characters are attacked by unjust and malicious slander? It is lawful, to be sure, in such a case, to embrace every opportunity of vindication; but, as it is not wonderful that it should happen, so the real Christian should study to bear it with meekness and to forgive it sincerely, as he asks forgiveness of God.

From all this it is easy to see, that the regenerate person must be humble. Believe it, O Christian, so much as you have of humility, so much you have of true religion. So much as your sentiments are altered in this respect, so much you have ground to think the change to be real; and so much as you take root downwards in true humility, in the same proportion you will bear fruit upwards, in all the duties of a regular, exemplary, and useful conversation.

2. Another excellent and useful evidence of regeneration, is the sanctification of natural and lawful affections. There are, perhaps, few either more sure or more plain evidences of real religion than this. Regeneration does not consist in giving us new souls, new faculties, or new affections; but in giving a new tendency and effect to those we had before. There are many persons to whom we bear naturally an affection, and it is far from being the design of religion to destroy this affection, but to regulate it in its measure, to keep it in its proper channel, and direct it to its proper end. This is a part of the subject which I have always thought of great moment and importance, on more accounts than one. It hath pleased God, by joining us together in society, to constitute a great variety of relations; these ties are of God's own making, and our affections to all persons so related to us are natural, and in some of them very strong. How then do they operate? In what manner do they express themselves? Nothing will more evidently prove what is the ruling disposition of the heart. Whenever we love others sincerely, we shew it by desiring and endeavouring to procure for them those blessings which we ourselves most highly esteem. Let us take any one of these relations for an example. Does a parent sincerely love his children? Religion doth not weaken, but strengthens this affection, and adds to the force of his obligation to serve them. But if the parent truly loveth God above all, how will his love to his children be expressed? Surely by desiring, above all, that they may be "born again." Their following sinful courses will give him unspeakably more grief than their poverty, sickness, or even death itself. He will be more concerned to make them, and more delighted to see them, good than great; and for this purpose every step of their education will be directed. Would not every parent shudder at the thought of sending a beloved child to a house infected with the plague, or any other scene where health or life would be in imminent danger? What then shall we think of those parents who, from the single prospect of gain, without scruple place their children in houses deeply infected with the leprosy of sin, and expose them, without the least necessity, to the most dangerous temptations?

I know there are some instances in Scripture of persons who have been considered as very pious themselves, who yet were shamefully negligent in this branch of their duty. Of these, Eli, mentioned in the Book of Samuel, is one, whose sons, though in the most sacred office, "made themselves vile, and he restrained them not." I imagine I could easily bring in doubt, if not the reality, at least the eminence of his piety, and others of the same kind, though often taken for granted without much examination; but I shall only observe what an opposite account is given of the Divine conduct toward Eli and toward Abraham, the father of the faithful. He revealed his will, and employed in his message the child Samuel, to the neglect of Eli, grown old in his courts, and denounced the most severe and terrible judgments against him and his house: "Behold, I will do a thing in Israel, at which both the ears of every one that heareth it shall tingle; in that day I will perform against Eli all things which I have spoken concerning his house: when I begin I will also make an end. For I have told him that I will judge his house for ever, for the iniquity which he knoweth," 1 Sam. iii. 11—13. On the contrary, see the honourable distinction put upon Abraham: "And the Lord said, Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do, seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him. For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment, that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him," Gen. xviii. 17—19.

Nothing, indeed, can be more plain from reason itself, than that, in proportion to the impression which parents have upon their own minds of the importance of salvation, will be their concern and care that their children also may be the heirs of everlasting life. Suffer me to ask every parent who reads this discourse, or rather, to beseech all such to ask themselves seriously, what are their own strongest desires and hopes concerning their children? In those moments when your affections are fondest, and your partial flattering expectations most distinctly formed, are you obliged to confess that your minds run much more upon the prospect of your children's living in ease and affluence, or being promoted to places of honour and trust, than their being brought to a saving acquaintance with Christ and him crucified, that, whether they live or die, they may be the Lord's? If this is the case, you have just ground to fear that you are of that unhappy number who "savour not the things that be of God, but the things that be of man."

3. Another excellent evidence of regeneration is, the moderation of our attachment to worldly enjoyments in general, and an habitual submission to the will of God. So soon as this change takes place, it will immediately and certainly abate the measure of our attachment to all earthly things. Formerly they were the all of the soul, its portion and its rest; but now a clear discovery being made of greater and better blessings, they must fall back into the second place. There is a wonderful difference between the rate and value of present possessions of any kind, in the eye of him who lives under the impressions of eternity, and of him who believes it but uncertainly, who understands it very imperfectly, and who thinks of it as seldom as conscience will give him leave. It must be confessed, we are all apt to be immoderate in our attachment to outward blessings; this is the effect and evidence of the weakness of our faith: but, so far as faith is in exercise, it must mortify carnal affection. There is no way in which an object appears so little as when it is contrasted with one infinitely greater, which is plainly the case here. The truth is, time and eternity, things temporal and things spiritual, are the opposite and rival objects of human attention and esteem. It is impossible that one of them can be exalted, or obtain influence in any heart, without a proportional depression of the other. They are also, as they severally prevail, the marks to distinguish those who are, and those who are not, brought again from the dead. For, as the apostle says, "to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace," Rom. viii. 6.

Farther, it is not only in abating the measure of our attachment to worldly things that religion shews itself, and the change is discovered, but in the use and application of them. The real Christian's powers and faculties, possessions and influence, are consecrated to God. His abilities are laid out for the glory of God. He no more considers them as a means of excelling others, and getting to himself a name, but of doing good. He finds it his highest pleasure to serve God with his talents; he thinks it his duty to plead for him in his conversation, to honour him with his substance, to enforce and ratify the divine laws by his authority and example.

The same thing shews plainly why a Christian must manifest his new nature by submission to the divine will. Does he receive his mercies from God? Does he love them less than God? Does he esteem it his duty to use them in his service? And can he possibly refuse to resign them to his pleasure? I am sensible that resignation to the will of God, absolute and unconditional, is a very difficult duty; but it is what every believer habitually studies to attain. He chides his remaining impatience and complaints, grieves at the continuing struggles of his imperfectly renewed will, and is sensible that in this the superiority of his affection to God above the creature ought to appear. Unrenewed persons, when their earthly hopes are disappointed, immediately renew the pursuit; they only change the object to one more within their reach, or they alter their measures, and endeavour to amend the scheme; but real Christians, receiving a conviction of the vanity of all created things, seek their refuge and consolation in the fulness and all-sufficiency of God.

Sect. IV.—A more particular inquiry into what properly constitutes the sincerity of the change.

Thus I have given a succinct view of the most remarkable effects and visible evidences of regeneration. I cannot, however, satisfy myself with this, because I am persuaded the great question is, how far they ought to go, and to what measure of strength and uniformity they ought to arrive. There are not a few who may, in a certain degree, sincerely think themselves possessed of most or all the dispositions mentioned above, whose state is nevertheless very much to be suspected. On the other hand, perhaps some of the humblest —that is to say, the very best—may be in much fear concerning themselves, because they do not perceive either that vigour or steadiness in their holy dispositions which they greatly desire, and are sensible they ought to attain. Besides, what hath been hitherto said is only general; namely—that those who are born again will have new apprehensions of things, will be humble, mortified to the world, and submissive to the will of God. In this way it will be most applicable to, or at least most sensible in, those who had once gone great lengths in profanity, and were, by the almighty and sovereign grace of God, snatched as "brands from the burning." The opposition between their new and old characters is ordinarily so great, that it will not admit of any doubt. To some others it may be necessary to make a more strict and particular inquiry into the nature of sincerity, and what is the full and proper evidence of the reality of the change.

That the reader may form as clear and distinct conceptions on this subject as possible, he may be pleased to recollect what was before observed—that perfect holiness consists in having the heart wholly possessed by the love of God, without the mixture of any inferior or baser passion; and that regeneration consists in a supreme desire to glorify God, and a preference of his favour to every other enjoyment. Now, what chiefly occasions difficulty in discerning the reality of this change is, that there is much unsubdued sin remaining in the children of God, and that there are many counterfeit graces or appearances of religion in those who are, notwithstanding, in the "gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity."

That there is a great degree of unmortified corruption still remaining in the saints of God, and that not so much as one is wholly free from it, is apparent from too many melancholy proofs. It appears from the pathetic complaint of the Apostle Paul, formerly referred to, of the law in his members warring against the law of God in his mind. It appears also, from the gross sins into which some eminently holy persons have been suffered occasionally to fall, through the strength of temptation; as David's adultery and murder, Solomon's idolatry, the Apostle Peter's denial of his Master, and several others recorded in Scripture.

On the other hand, there are also counterfeit graces, common or imperfect operations of the Spirit, which do not issue in a real conversion and saving change. This it will be proper to keep in mind, and perhaps, also, to attend a little to the proofs of it, both from Scripture and experience. That the word of God has some effect even upon those who continue unrenewed, is plain from many examples recorded in the sacred volume. We read of a Felix trembling at the thoughts of a judgment to come: "And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled, and answered, Go thy way this time; when I have a convenient season I will call for thee," Acts, xxiv. 25. But we are not informed that he ever found that convenient season, or desired to hear any more of such words.

In the parable of the Sower, we have a character described of those who not only "heard" the word, but "received" it with joy, and on whom it had an immediate and visible, though only a temporary, effect: "Some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth, and forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth; and when the sun was up, they were scorched; and, because they had no root, they withered away," Matt. xiii. 5, 6. "He that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it: yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while; for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended," ver. 20, 21. We read also of a Herod, who not only heard the word gladly, but "did many things." "For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man, and an holy, and observed him; and when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly," Mark, vi. 20. Nay, we see even Ahab, the profane prince of Israel, humbling himself, and putting on sackcloth, under the denunciation of Divine wrath. Neither have we any reason, from the circumstances of the story, to believe that this was wholly hypocritical, but the contrary. "And it came to pass when Ahab heard these words, that he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth on his flesh, and fasted, and lay in sackcloth, and went softly," 1 Kings, xxi. 27. These things, and all others of the same kind, even in wicked men, are represented as the effect of the operation of the Spirit, in many passages of Scripture. I shall only mention one, which is pretty remarkable, and well merits our attention: "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the power of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again to repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame," Heb. vi. 4—6.

The same thing, indeed, appears plainly from the state of the world, and in a particular manner from that variety of partial characters which I have formerly described. There are many things which have a religious appearance, and are taken by the deluded possessor for religion, when at bottom there is no real religion at all; and "mene tekel" shall be written upon them in the day of trial. There is a long gradation of characters between the openly profane sinner, with a hardened heart, a seared conscience, and a shameless countenance, on the one hand; and the refined, self-deceiving hypocrite, with his duties and his forms, on the other: between those who are furious, violent, and malignant enemies to religion in profession and practice; and those who answer discreetly with the scribe mentioned in the gospel; and of whom it may be said, as our Saviour says of him, that they "are not far from the kingdom of God." This shews at once the importance and difficulty of pointing out the great and distinguishing characters of real religion, and shewing how it essentially differs from all counterfeits.

But now, from the account before given of the nature of regeneration, and what hath been farther added in illustration of it, we may see how this distinction is to be made, as far as it can be made by any, excepting the great Searcher of hearts. I apprehend, that the great and distinguishing mark of the truth and sincerity of religion in general, and of every gracious disposition in particular, arises from comparing it with its opposite. It is "the prevailing interest of God and the Redeemer in the heart, above the interest of inferior good; the habitual comparative preference we give to his service and enjoyment, before every other object of desire." This must be proved by its effects daily. And, agreeably to this, our blessed Lord says, "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me," Matt. x. 37, 38. And again, in yet stronger terms, "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple," Luke, xiv. 26. Would you, therefore, know whether you are born again? Are you in doubt, when you find the spirit lusting against the flesh, and the flesh against the spirit? Try, by diligent and universal examination, which of them is, upon the whole, the strongest; which of them habitually yields to the other, when they come in competition. Into this all other marks and signs of religion resolve themselves at last; and from the evidence they give of the prevalence of the love of God in the heart, they derive all their worth and value. Every holy disposition must be examined, not by its absolute, but its comparative strength; and the true knowledge of our state arises from the conclusion and result of the whole.

There were in the last age many and great debates among men of piety and learning, whether special and common grace differ essentially in their nature, or if they differ only in degree. What I have just now said may, perhaps, be thought by the intelligent reader to imply my embracing the last of these opinions. My judgment of this question is the same I have formed of many others, that it is unnecessary, or even hurtful. It has, perhaps, if examined to the bottom, no distinct meaning at all; but, if it has any meaning, I am afraid it is a question which it is impossible for us to resolve. That it may be made plain to persons of common understanding, the question is, whether it is most proper to say, that a wicked man, or an unrenewed person, let his behaviour be ever so unexceptionable, or his experiences ever so comfortable, can have no true love to God, no, not in the least degree; or whether we ought not rather to say, his love to God is less than his love to the creature. I confess, I think it is best to say, in the words of the Holy Ghost, that "he loveth the creature more than the Creator;" that he loveth the "praise of men" more than "the praise of God;" and for this reason, he hath no true love, either to God or man.

In the preceding part of this treatise, I have affirmed, with sufficient clearness, that there must be an essential change, in order to salvation; and that, till this be wrought, the person is in sin, and can do nothing but sin. The reason of this is very plain: that the supreme and governing motive of all his actions is wrong, and therefore every one of them must be so, upon the whole. I suppose, if they were to explain themselves fully, this is chiefly meant by those who insist that there is an essential difference between special and common grace. And in this view, no doubt, it is not only certainly true, but a truth of very great importance. It appears, however, on the other hand, equally certain and undeniable, that, when we observe good dispositions and good actions in one character, and see the same appearances in another, we have no way by which we can discover the difference, but by their perseverance, and their comparative effects. Neither, indeed, has the person himself any other rule by which they can be judged. For which reason I would be very willing to affirm both sides of the above question,—to say that an unregenerate person has no true love to God, or his neighbour; and at the same time, that this is only because no love, but that which is supreme and prevalent, is true, or will be accepted as sincere.

Unless we take up the matter in this light, we are in danger of doing great hurt on both hands. On the one hand, it is ready to alarm the pious, humble, and timorous soul, if we say that special grace differs essentially from common grace, and that there must be something quite different in its kind, as to every gracious disposition, than what ever resided in hypocrites. Alas! will the fearful person say, I have seen some who have gone great lengths, who have been well esteemed, and well received among all serious people, and yet have made shipwreck of the faith, dishonoured their profession, and opened the mouths of adversaries to blaspheme. They had all the appearance of as much love to God, as much delight in his service, as much zeal for his glory, as much strictness, and as much usefulness of conversation, nay, more than I can pretend to. What, then, am I to think of this? Must all my gracious dispositions be essentially different from theirs? And how is this difference to be made appear? To all such I would say, Those unhappy persons, by their conduct, and that alone, plainly discover, that they have been either wholly impostors, and deceivers of the world, or that they have loved some object of carnal affection, some lust of one kind or another, more than they loved God. The strength of their affections in one way, has been overbalanced by the dominion of corruption in another. And that corruption which has been long disguised, or restrained, at last breaks out with so much the greater violence and the greater noise.

Again, on the other hand, by affirming that there is a difference in kind between special and common grace, and that a hypocrite, or unrenewed person, cannot have the least measure of the same sort of love to God or man with a child of God, we are apt to make some slaves to sin, upon examining themselves, judge amiss in their own favour. They cannot help thinking that they have a real unfeigned affection for that which is good in many respects, as indeed they have, when it doth not stand in competition with their reigning or darling lust. To give an example of this, it is frequently made a mark of true religion, to love the people of God; and, indeed, it is one of the best, and when taken in the sense I have mentioned above, as a supreme and prevalent love, it is an infallible sign. It hath no less a warrant than the word of God: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren; he that loveth not his brother abideth in death," 1 John, iii. 14. But I dare say there are many who live in sin, and are strangers to the power of godliness, who, upon the most impartial examination of themselves, would conclude that they did love the people of God.

Perhaps some will say, that such persons may love good men, but they love them for other qualities, and cannot love them because of their piety. Experience tells us the contrary. They may esteem them, love them, speak well of them, and do them service, because of their piety. Nay, I have known (though that is more rare) some very loose livers, who seemed to have nothing good about them but an esteem of pious persons, and a desire to espouse their cause, which they continued to do in all ordinary cases. But, should these servants of God presume to reprove them sharply, or hinder them in the enjoyment of their darling lust, their love would turn to hatred. Who would not have said that Herod sincerely loved John the Baptist, when the very reason assigned for his respect and attendance is, that "he was a just man and an holy." Yet the same Herod, when he was reproved by John for his scandalous adultery and incest, shut him up in prison; and afterwards, so little was his constancy, that when the daughter of Herodias had gained upon his affection by her dancing, and involved him in a rash promise, he gratified her mother's savage cruelty with the Baptist's head. The description of his situation of mind is remarkable, but far from being singular; we are told, "the king was exceeding sorry, yet for his oath's sake, and for their sakes that sat with him, he would not reject her," Mark, vi. 26. Here was love in one sense, or in a certain degree; but he loved the damsel and her mother, and the good opinion of his courtly companions, still more than the faithful preacher.

We have innumerable examples of the same thing every day before our eyes. Voluptuous men love the people of God, but will not obey their salutary counsel, because they love their lusts more. Covetous men will love the people of God, and praise them, and defend them, but will not open their purses to provide for them, because they love their silver and gold more. What I have said of this disposition might be easily shewn to hold with regard to every other. In short, whatever unseen or inward difference there may be; whatever diversity of operation of the Holy and Sovereign Spirit, the great trial to us is the same which Christ made of Peter: "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?" It is good that we should often repeat the question, as he did; and blessed is that man who is able in sincerity to say with Peter, "Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee," John, xxi. 17.

I am sensible there will be many ready to challenge this, or at least to be inwardly dissatisfied with it, as too general and undetermined. They will be ready to think that this leaves the matter still at a great uncertainty, and that it must be very difficult to decide in many cases whether the love of God or of the world hath the greatest habitual influence in the heart. The truth is, I am far from denying or dissembling that it is a matter of great difficulty in many instances; nay, as I have hinted in some of the former pages of this discourse, there are cases in which it is altogether impossible to come to any certain determination. In some, grace and corruption are so equally matched, as it were, have such violent struggles, and take their turns so often, in restraining and governing one another, that it will be hard to tell, till the last day, which of them was strongest upon the whole. But this is no just objection to what I have before delivered. It was never intended that such unequal and variable Christians should enjoy much peace; and if they do, it is surely upon some idle or imaginary ground. To many it may be justly said, as Jacob said to his son Reuben, "Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel," Gen. xlix. 4. Instead of devising ways, and making suppositions to encourage such persons to think well of their own state, it is a far safer, and much kinder office, to excite them to a holy jealousy over themselves. This indeed seems to be the language of Scripture with regard to us all: "Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it," Heb. iv. 1. Elsewhere, says the same apostle, "And we desire that every one of you do shew the same diligence, to the full assurance of hope, unto the end," Heb. vi. 11.

The life of a Christian is constantly represented in Scripture as a life of vigilance and caution, of activity and diligence. "Be sober and vigilant, for your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour," 1 Pet. v. 8. The same apostle says, "And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience godliness, and to godliness brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness charity: for, if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure," 2 Pet. i. 5—10. I beg it may be observed, that this is no way contrary to that confidence in the Divine mercy, and good hope through grace, which the Gospel imparts to the believer. These are intended to animate him to diligence in duty, in dependence on Divine strength, and are themselves gradually confirmed and improved by producing their proper effects. Few seem to have enjoyed more of the consolations of the Gospel than the Apostle Paul; and yet he represents even the fear of final disappointment as what daily influenced his own conduct. "But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway," 1 Cor. ix. 27.

I cannot help taking notice here, that there is often just cause to find fault even with persons who, to all appearance, are sincerely pious, upon this subject. For all such I desire to have the highest esteem, and to treat them with the greatest tenderness and affection. In the mean time, they ought to be willing and even desirous, of having their mistakes pointed out to them. Now, I am persuaded there are many who seek after assurance of their own interest in God's favour in a wrong way, and that they often expect it in a degree that is not suited to the present state.

1. They often seek it in a wrong way; they are ready to lay hold of impressions upon their minds, and, in a variety of particulars, are in danger of repeating the sin of the Pharisees, who asked a sign from heaven. When a minister is speaking or writing on this subject, they expect something particular and personal; and, if I may speak so, that he should be in God's stead, and give them assurance, in place of telling them how they ought to seek it. But this eagerness, from however good a disposition it may spring, is unwarranted and preposterous. We must be satisfied to walk in the way that God hath pointed out to us; to give thanks to him for the sure foundation of a sinner's hope which is laid in Zion, and to conclude the safety of our own state from a serious and deliberate examination of ourselves by the rules laid down in the Holy Scriptures. In this way only is the most solid, settled, and lasting peace to be obtained.

Perhaps some will be ready to say, Do you then condemn in general all regard to impressions that may be sensibly felt upon the mind, or all secret and powerful suggestions of passages of Scripture? Does the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, never in this manner enlighten or refresh those souls in whom he dwells, according to his promise? "I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people," 2 Cor. vi. 16. No, far from it; I have no design of denying the real operation or gracious presence of the Spirit of God, which is certainly one of the most essential, and one of the most comfortable doctrines of the "glorious Gospel;" but at the same time, from the love I bear to it, I would guard it against mistakes and abuse. When any truth, or any passage of Scripture, is suggested to the mind, which particularly and strongly points out the duty proper to our present state and circumstances; when this is backed with a powerful sense of its obligation, and by that means a deceitful or slothful heart is revived and quickened: this is thankfully to be acknowledged, and readily complied with. When a doubtful, dejected, or desponding mind is relieved, by a strong and affecting view of some encouraging promise or gracious invitation to the weary sinner, or the contrite spirit; when, in such a case, the mind is led to a discovery of the rich mercy and free grace of God to the guilty and miserable, it ought to be embraced and improved; and in many such instances, serious persons, harassed by temptation, have had cause to say with David, "I will bless the Lord, who hath given me counsel; my reins also instruct me in the night seasons," Psal. xvi. 7.

This is no more than the necessary consequence of the constant overruling providence of God, which, as it extends to the disposal and direction of the most minute circumstances in the course of nature, cannot fail to be particularly exercised about the holiness and peace of his own children. They obey what appears to be their duty, or an argument against sin; they trust the Divine faithfulness in what concerns their comfort; and adore the Divine wisdom and goodness in the propriety and seasonableness of either or both. But for any person, from the sudden suggestion of a passage of Scripture, "I am thy God," for example, or, "I have called thee by thy name, thou art mine," without any examination of his temper and disposition, to conclude the safety of his state, is surely a piece of presumption without ground.

Neither is it less foolish than presumptuous; for all such must be liable to be cast down by other and contrary suggestions. We know very well, and have an instance of it in our Saviour's temptation, that Satan can suggest passages of Scripture; nay, and speak piously and plausibly upon them; but their conclusions must be tried by other Scriptures. To all who are inclined to the above deluding practice, I would say with the Apostle John; "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God," 1 John iv. 1. Or with the Prophet Isaiah, "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them," Isa. viii. 20. There is also a very proper advice, mixed with caution, given by the same prophet, in the following words: "Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of his servant, that walketh in darkness, and hath no light? let him trust in the name of the Lord, and stay upon his God. Behold, all ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves about with sparks: walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks that ye have kindled: this shall ye have of mine hand, ye shall lie down in sorrow," Isa. l. 10, 11.

2. I must also observe, that many serious persons seem to desire, and even to expect, assurance in such a measure and degree, as is not suited to our present state. They would have faith and hope to be the same with sense. They would have heaven and earth to be the same, and would put on their crown before they have finished their course. I am persuaded, many deprive themselves of that comfort to which they have an undoubted title, and which they might easily possess, by aiming at that which is beyond their reach. They do not remember, that it is true in this respect as well as in many others, what the apostle says, "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face; now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known," 1 Cor. xiii. 12. Would you but reflect upon yourselves, Christians, you would be ashamed of your complaints. You would be ashamed, that you should so much as lay claim to so high a degree of comfort, when you are so careless in your duty. Your improvement in the spiritual life is but very gradual, and therefore it is no wonder your hope should be but in proportion to it.

It is of the greatest consequence in religion, to distinguish carefully between that hope and comfort which arises directly from the promises of God in Scripture, and that which arises from a reflex observation of the change that has taken place in our own temper and practice. To entertain and encourage doubts in the former case, is directly contrary both to our duty and interest; but in the other, perhaps suspicion and diffidence are most becoming the Christian temper, and most conducive to the advancement of the Christian life. Is there any person perusing this treatise, who is incommoded and distressed with anxiety and fear? Take heed that you be not doubting as much of the certainty of God's word, as you are jealous of your own state. Is it not more than sufficient that you have so many gracious invitations, so many full, free, and unlimited offers of mercy, through a Redeemer, to the chief of sinners? Does it not give repose to the mind, and rest to the conscience, when, by direct acts of faith, you receive and rely on Christ alone for salvation; seeing him to be single in this undertaking, and all-sufficient for its accomplishment, and therefore cleaving to him as your Lord and your God, and your all? I would not choose to affirm, that assurance, in the ordinary sense of that word, is essential to faith, or that its proper description is, to believe that my sins are forgiven me; yet surely some measure of hope is inseparable from it. Faith and despair are opposite and inconsistent. If you do really believe the sincerity of the offer, if you do really believe the fulness and ability of the Saviour, "the God of hope will fill you with all joy and peace in believing, through the power of the Holy Ghost."

To this let me add, that, considering the matter even with regard to a renewing and sanctifying work of the Spirit upon your hearts, your complaints are often excessive and unreasonable. You would have evidence, not that the work is begun, but that it is finished. You desire comfort, not such as is sufficient to strengthen you against temptation, and bear you up under suffering; but such as would make temptation to be no temptation, and suffering to be no suffering.

But if you are sensible that you still adhere to God as your portion, that you cannot find peace or rest in any thing else, and that a whole world would not induce you to give up even your doubtful title to his favour and love, surely you ought to endeavour after composure of mind: you may be frequently in the state of the Apostle Paul, who says of himself, "Our flesh had no rest, but we were troubled on every side; without were fightings, within were fears," 2 Cor. viii. 5. And yet say with the same apostle, "We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed," 2 Cor. iv. 8, 9. It is not meant by this to condemn an earnest desire to abound in hope, or a frequent and strict examination of our state and temper, but to warn Christians against impatience, and against an unthankful, fretful disposition, which indeed disappoints itself, and prevents the attainment of that peace, for the want of which it complains.

This leads naturally to the mention of another fault incident to serious persons, which will lay a foundation for a very important lesson upon this subject. The fault here intended is, falling into a slothful, despondent neglect of duty. The devices of Satan, our great enemy, are very various, and unspeakably artful. When he cannot keep men in security, and drive them blindly along the broad path which leadeth to destruction, he endeavours to make their duty as painful and burdensome to them as possible. When some persons give themselves to serious self-examination, he embarrasses them with scruples, he involves them in doubts, he distresses them with fears. This often brings on a relaxation or suspension of their diligence in duty; they give themselves up to anxious, complaining thoughts; they stand still, and will go no farther in religion, till they are satisfied whether they have as yet gone any length at all. But whatever good ground any person may have to be dissatisfied with himself, so soon as he perceives that this is the effect, he ought to resist it as a temptation. I cannot better illustrate this, than by a similitude borrowed from the Scripture language on the same subject. Whether do you think that child most dutiful, under a sense of his father's displeasure, who patiently and silently applies himself to his work, or he who saunters about in idleness, and, with peevish and sullen complaints, is constantly calling in question his father's love?

This lays the foundation for a very necessary and useful direction, which indeed flows naturally from all that has been said on the evidence of regeneration. Endeavour, Christians, to preserve and increase your hope in God, by farther degrees of sanctification, by zeal and diligence in doing his will. The more the image of God in you is perfected, it will be the more easily discerned. If you are at any time ready to doubt whether such or such corruptions are consistent with real religion; if you find this a hard question to resolve, go another way to work, and strive by vigilance and prayer to mortify these corruptions, and then the difficulty is removed. If, in a time of affliction and distress, you find it hard to determine whether it ought to be considered as the correction of a father, or the severity of a judge, endeavour through Divine grace to bear it with the patience of a child, and you will soon see its merciful original by its salutary effect. What should be the daily study of a Christian, but to mortify sin in heart and conversation? and his comfort should arise from his apparent success in this important strife. When grain of different kinds is but springing from the ground, it is not easy to distinguish between one and another, but their growth ascertains their quality, which is still more fully discerned as they approach nearer to maturity. Imitate in this the great Apostle of the Gentiles: "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended, but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus," Phil. iii. 12—14.

Before closing this section, I must observe, that though the account I have given of the great mark of real religion, may still leave some in the dark, yet surely it carries in it the clearest and plainest condemnation of many hearers of the gospel. Oh, that it were possible to fasten a conviction of it upon their minds! Are there not many who appear from Sabbath to Sabbath in the house of God, who dare not affirm seriously to their own hearts, that God and his service has more of their habitual settled affection than the world, or any of its enjoyments? I do not here understand gross sinners, whose crimes are "open, going before unto judgment;" but I mean the more sober and regular professors of religion, who may have "a form of godliness, and deny the power thereof." I am persuaded this is a more proper trial of their state, than any particular rule of duty. Many such persons know so little of the extent and spirituality of the law of God, that it is not impossible they may be ready to affirm they do not allow themselves in any known sin, as the young man in the Gospel seems to have answered sincerely, when he said to our Saviour, "Master, all these have I observed from my youth," Mark, x. 20. But I would farther ask them, Whether hath God or the world most of your love, most of your thoughts, and most of your care? Can such of you pretend this, whose eager, ardent, nightly thought, and daily pleasure, is only to increase your substance? who would not go to market without re-examining your transactions, and computing your gain; but can daily go to the house of God, without observing, inquiring after, or desiring to see its proper fruits? Can such of you pretend this, to whom all serious conversation is tedious and disgustful, and the society of good men a painful restraint? to whom the Sabbath is a dull, melancholy, and burdensome season? O my brethren, let me beseech you to be faithful to your own souls. Your precious time is daily hastening on; the day of your merciful visitation is wearing fast away. Hear, while there is yet peace, and entreat that God, for Christ's sake, would freely pardon all your sins; would renew you in the spirit of your minds; would fit you for his service on earth, and for his presence and enjoyment in heaven.

Thus I have explained, at considerable length, and with all the care and accuracy in my power, the great and general evidence of regeneration, namely, the superiority of the interest of God and the Redeemer in the heart, above the interest of inferior good. This, I hope, will be of use in itself, to distinguish the precious from the vile, to preserve you from sin, and excite you to diligence in every part of your duty, that it may be more and more manifest. At the same time, it will be of the greatest service, in the use and application of other signs of religion, by shewing when they are conclusive, and when they are not.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE STEPS BY WHICH THIS CHANGE IS ACCOMPLISHED.

We proceed now to consider by what steps, and by what means, this change is brought about. I am deeply sensible how difficult a part of the subject this is, and how hard it will be to treat of it in a distinct and precise, and, at the same time, in a cautious and guarded manner. It is often complained of in those who write on this subject, that they confine and limit the Holy One, and that they give unnecessary alarms to those who have not had experience of every particular which they think proper to mention. There is no doubt but God acts in an absolute* and sovereign manner in the dispensation of his grace, as in every other part of his will. As he cannot be limited as to persons, so neither as to the time and manner of their reformation. To this purpose, and in this precise meaning, our Saviour says, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit," John, iii. 8.

Sometimes it pleaseth God to snatch sinners from the very brink of the pit, to raise up some of the most abandoned profligates, as trophies of his victorious grace and mercy; while he suffers others, far more moderate and decent, who are "not far from the kingdom of God," finally to fall short of it. He sometimes glorifies his power and mercy at once, by converting his most inveterate enemies, and making them the most zealous, active, and successful advocates for his cause. Such an instance was the Apostle Paul, who from a persecutor became a preacher. Sometimes conversion is speedily and suddenly brought about, and the times and circumstances of the change may be easily ascertained. This was the case with the jailer, recorded in the history of the Acts of the Apostles. The same may be said of the Apostle Paul; and there have been particular examples of it in every age. Sometimes, on the other hand, the reception of the truth, and renovation of the heart, goes on by slow and insensible degrees; nor is it easy to say by what means the change was begun, or at what time it was completed. This was perhaps the case with most, if not all, the disciples of our Lord, during his personal ministry.

Sometimes the change is very signal and sensible, the growth and improvement of the spiritual life speedy and remarkable, the greatest sinners becoming the most eminent saints; like the woman mentioned in the gospel, to whom many sins were forgiven, and who loved her Redeemer much. Sometimes, on the other hand, the change is very doubtful, and the progress of the believer hardly discernible. Some of this sort are reproved by the Apostle Paul in the following words, which are but too applicable to many professing Christians of the present age: "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat," Heb. v. 12. Sometimes the convert hath much peace and sensible comfort, rejoicing with joy unspeakable, and full of glory; and sometimes, on the other hand, he is distressed with doubts and fears, and made to walk in darkness. Once more, some sinners are brought in by deep and long humiliation, and are almost distracted with legal terrors; while others are powerfully, though sweetly, constrained by the cords of Divine love. All these "worketh the selfsame Spirit, who divideth to every man severally as he will." I desire, that what has now been said, may be still kept in mind; so that if the evidences of a saving change can be produced, there need be little solicitude about the time or manner of its being wrought.

---

* It will be proper to inform the reader, that the word "absolute" used here, and in some other places of this discourse, is by no means to be understood as signifying the same thing with "arbitrary." He who acts arbitrarily acts without any reason at all. To say this of the Divine procedure, would be little less than blasphemy. When we say that God acts "in an absolute and sovereign manner," the meaning is, that he acts upon the best and strongest reasons, and for the noblest and most excellent ends; but which are many or most of them beyond our reach and comprehension; and particularly, that there is not the least foundation for supposing that the reasons of preference are taken from comparative human merit.

What I propose to offer upon this part of the subject, is not to be considered as in the least degree contrary to, or inconsistent with, these truths. Nay, I am not to lay down a plan, and say, this is the ordinary way in which sinners are brought to the saving knowledge of God, leaving it to him, in some few, uncommon, and extraordinary cases, to take sovereign steps, and admit exceptions from the ordinary rules. This is a way of speaking common enough; but though it may be very well meant, I apprehend it hath not in it much either of truth or utility. The salvation of every child of Adam is of free, absolute, sovereign grace: and the actual change may be wrought at any time, in any manner, by any means, and will produce its effects in any measure, that to infinite wisdom shall seem proper. Neither ought we to pretend to account for the diversity in any other manner than our Saviour does: "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight," Luke, x. 21. Therefore what I have in view, is to speak of such steps in the change as are, in substance at least, common to all true converts. It will be a sort of analysis, or more full explication of the change itself, and serve, among other uses, farther to distinguish the real from the counterfeit. Too much can hardly be said on this subject: "For what is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord." It will also illustrate the Divine wisdom, as well as sovereignty, by shewing how that diversity of operation, so remarkable in different subjects, produces in all at last the same blessed effects.

Sect. I.—There must be a discovery of the real nature of God.

In the first place, one important and necessary step in bringing about a saving change, is, that the sinner get a discovery of the real nature, the infinite majesty, and transcendent glory of the living God! Perhaps some will be surprised, that, as usual, a conviction of sin is not mentioned first, as the preliminary step. I enter into no quarrel or debate with those who do so; but I have first mentioned the other, which is but seldom taken notice of, from a firm persuasion, that a discovery of the nature and glory of the true God lies at the foundation of all. This alone can produce salutary convictions of sin; for how can we know what sin is, till we know Him against whom we have sinned. The same thing only will point out the difference between real conviction, and such occasional fears as never go farther than a spirit of bondage.

In support of this, you may observe, that in Scripture, those who are in a natural or unconverted state, are often described as lying in a state of ignorance or darkness. They are said to be such as know not God: "Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods," Gal. iv. 8. See also the following description: "Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their hearts," Eph. iv. 18. Agreeably to this, the change produced in them is represented as giving them light or understanding, in opposition to their former ignorance; "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God," Acts, xxvi. 18. "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them. For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4, 6. In this way is the matter represented in Scripture, much more frequently than is commonly observed; and as the understanding is the leading faculty in our nature, it is but reasonable to suppose that the change should begin there, by a discovery of the nature and glory of God, as the foundation of all that is afterwards to follow.

This will be farther evident, if we reflect upon the account formerly given, and sufficiently supported from the Holy Scriptures, of the nature of this change, That it consists in a supreme regard to the glory of God, and an habitual prevailing desire of his favour. To this it is absolutely necessary, as a preliminary, that there be a discovery of the real nature and transcendent glory of God. How can any man have that as the chief and leading motive of action, which he doth not understand? How can any man have that as the supreme object of desire, which he doth not know? Neither of these is possible; there must, therefore, be some such discovery as I have mentioned. It is true, this is but imperfect at first; there will be in the truly regenerate a growing discovery of the glory of God, as well as a growing delight in him, as its consequence; yet there must be some view of his nature, as the beginning of the change, and the groundwork of every holy disposition.

This discovery of God implies two things, which, as they are both necessary, so they deserve our particular attention; and it is not improper to distinguish carefully the one from the other. 1. It must be a discovery of his real nature. 2. A discovery of the worth and excellence of his nature, which is, properly speaking, the glory of God.

1. It must be a discovery of the real nature of God. He must be seen to be just such a Being as he really is, and no false or adulterated image must be placed in his room, or adored in his stead. He must be seen in his spiritual nature, as almighty in his power, unsearchable in his wisdom, inviolable in his truth; but, above all, he must be seen as infinite in his holiness and hatred of sin, as impartial in his justice, and determined to punish it. Such is the Scripture representation of God, as "glorious in his holiness. Evil cannot dwell with him, and sinners cannot stand in his presence." It is the error of the wicked to suppose the contrary; and, indeed, it is the very source of wickedness, to deny the being, or to deny the holiness, of God; and these amount much to the same thing. "Wherefore doth the wicked contemn God? he hath said in his heart, thou wilt not require it, "Psal. x. 13. "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God," Psal. xiv. 1. "These things thou hast done, and I kept silence; thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself, but I will reprove thee, and set them in order before thine eyes," Psal. l. 21.

God must be seen as he is represented in his own word, which is the only rule of faith, the pillar and ground of truth. This is a matter of the greatest importance, which, I am sorry to say, is in this age very seldom attended to, but which is most manifestly and undeniably just. If God is not seen in his real nature, as he is in truth, he can never be acceptably served. If a wrong or false character of God is formed, no worship we can offer to him, no love or respect we can bear to him, is genuine; or rather, to speak more properly, our service and attachment is in that case wholly misplaced, and not directed to him at all, but something else is loved, honoured, and served in his room. I beseech the serious reader to observe what an unspeakable jealousy God discovered under the Old Testament dispensation as to the purity of his worship, and what a heinous crime all idolatry was esteemed. How great was the divine displeasure at the making and worshipping the golden calf, although it is very probable Aaron only intended to represent the true God by the same symbol they had seen in Egypt! Did not this belong to the substance, and not only to the circumstances of religion? Is it not, then, equally interesting under the New Testament as under the Old? Was the unchangeable God so much displeased at giving him a false name, and will he not be equally displeased with those who attribute to him a false nature?

As this truth serves to explain the nature and rise of regeneration, so it also receives particular light and evidence itself from what has been said in the preceding parts of this subject. Regeneration consists in having the image of God again drawn upon the heart; that is, its being carried out to the supreme love of God and delight in him: or, in other words, brought to the supreme love of, and delight in, perfect goodness and immaculate holiness. When this is the case the sinner is renewed; he again bears the image of God, which he had lost; he is again fitted for the presence of God, from which he had been expelled. But he has wrong notions of God if he takes him to be essentially different from what he really is; he serves not the true God at all, he bears not his image, he delights not in his fellowship, he is unfit for his presence. If religion consists in a divine nature, such a person does not possess it, unless there are more gods than one. There may, indeed, be an alteration in him, he may have transferred his allegiance, and changed his master, for idols are many, but he is not brought unto God; and so long as God is immutable, his happiness is impossible.

I can recollect nothing that is worth notice as an objection against this, but that our knowledge of God, at any rate, is extremely imperfect and defective. It is so, to be sure, while we are in this world; nay, probably, it will be so to all eternity: for "who can by searching find out God? Who can find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is high as heaven, what can we do? deeper than hell, what can we know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea," Job, xi. 7—9. But there is a great difference between the imperfection of our knowledge of God, and forming conceptions of him that are fundamentally wrong. There is a great difference between having weak and inadequate ideas of the truth, and believing or acting upon the opposite falsehood. Unless this is admitted, we shall never see the unspeakable advantage which the Jews enjoyed over the Gentiles, "because to them were committed the oracles of God;" nor indeed shall we see the worth and beauty of the ancient dispensation in general. It was one uniform display of this great and important truth, which is delivered with so much majesty by God himself: "I am the Lord, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images." Neither is this at all relaxed under the New Testament. The importance of "holding the truth as it is in Jesus," of "holding fast the form of sound words," and "keeping the truth," is often declared, as well as that "no lie is of the truth." And no wonder that in this pure and spiritual constitution, it should be necessary to have clear and distinct views of him who is "the Father of spirits."

Thus I hope it appears, that in order to a saving change, there must be a discovery of the real nature of the one only, the living and true God. Before we proceed farther, let me observe, that hence may be seen, in the clearest light, the danger both of ignorance and error.

1. Of ignorance. It is plain that those who are grossly ignorant must be unrenewed. Those who do not know God, cannot possibly love him. Do you not now see the meaning and weight of the strong language of Scripture, where we are told the heathen nations were sitting "in darkness, and in the region and shadow of death?" What force should this give to the prayers so often offered up, both in public and in private, that the "name" of God may be "hallowed," and his kingdom come! How much should it add to the zeal and diligence, especially of those who are appointed to watch for the souls of others! What concern should it give them, lest any under their immediate inspection "should perish for lack of knowledge." It is indeed surprising to think, what gross ignorance prevails at present among many, notwithstanding the excellent opportunities of instruction which they have in their offer. Nay, even among those who are instructed in several branches of human science, it is astonishing to think what ignorance there is of every thing that relates to religion.

If accident or curiosity has brought this discourse into the hands of any such, let me entreat their attention for a little. I beseech you to think upon and tremble at your state. You may have some sort of a nominal belief of an unseen, unintelligible being, called God, while you know neither "what you speak, nor whereof you affirm." You may perhaps have heard, or rather in our happy native country you cannot but have heard, of Christ Jesus, the Son of God, styled often the Saviour of sinners; but you know neither the Father nor the "Son." You know not God as Creator, nor, by consequence, your obligations and duty to him, or your apostacy and departure from both. You know not what sin is, and, therefore, you cannot know a Saviour. If ever you come to true religion at all, light will break in upon you in your darkness, you will no more be able to forget God, he will follow you into your secret chambers, he will come home upon you, and assault you as it were with the reality of his presence, with the sanctity and purity of his nature, and the terrible majesty of his power. Oh how great is the effect of a real discovery of the Divine glory, whether in the word, or by the providence of God; to a saint, or to a sinner! Hear how Job expresses himself: "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee; wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes," Job, xlii. 5, 6. We have the same thing well described by the Prophet Isaiah, as the effect of Divine power in desolating judgments: "Enter into the rock, and hide thee in the dust, for the fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty. The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day.—And they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth. In that day a man shall cast his idols of silver, and his idols of gold, which they made each one for himself to worship, to the moles and to the bats, to go into the clefts of the rocks, and into the tops of the ragged rocks, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth," Isa. ii. 10, 11.; 19—21. So soon as it pleases God to open your eyes upon himself, with whom you have to do, it will humble you in the dust, it will discover your danger, it will make redemption precious to you, and the name of a Saviour unspeakably dear.

2. The same thing shews the danger of error, as well as ignorance. Among many loose and pernicious principles, which are zealously spread, and blindly embraced in this age, one of the most prevailing and dangerous is, the innocence of error. "Oh," say some, "every man is to inquire freely, and each will embrace what appears to him to be the truth. It is no matter what a man believes, if his life be good. Even he who mistakes, may be as acceptable to God as his opposite, if he is equally sincere." Now, there is no doubt, that liberty to inquire freely is an inestimable blessing, and impartiality in religious inquiries an indispensable duty. But the above maxim becomes false and dangerous, by being carried to an excessive length; and it is carried to this excess, by the favour of two suppositions, which are false and groundless. The maxim is applied frequently to justify an open and virulent opposition to the most important truths of the Gospel; nay, sometimes, even to a denial of all religion, natural and revealed. To be able to apply it thus, it is necessary to suppose that false opinions will have as good an influence upon the heart as true. If this is the case, the boasted privilege of free inquiry is not worth having, and all the labour bestowed on the search of truth is entirely thrown away. Another supposition contained in the above maxim is, that a person may be as sincere in embracing gross falsehoods, as in

adhering to the truth. If this be true, our Creator hath not given us the means to distinguish the one from the other, which is the highest impeachment both of his wisdom and goodness.

Such persons do not consider, that a corrupt inclination in the heart brings a bias on the judgment, and that when men do not "like to retain God in their knowledge," he frequently, in his righteous judgment, gives them up to a reprobate mind. Nay, when they reject his truth from an inward hatred of its purity, he is said to send them "strong delusions," as in the following passage: "Because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved: for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness," 2 Thes. ii. 10—12. But the nature of regeneration will serve, in a peculiar manner, to shew the danger of error. If men form wrong notions of God, if they love, and worship, and resemble a false god, they cannot be renewed; they are not like, and therefore are unfit for the presence of, the true God. Be not deceived, he cannot deny himself, and therefore there is no fellowship of righteousness with unrighteousness, no communion of light with darkness, no concord of Christ with Belial, 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15.

I must here, to prevent mistakes, observe, that this ought, by no means, to be extended to differences of smaller moment, under which I rank all those which regard only the externals of religion. I am fully convinced, that many of very different parties and denominations are building upon the one "foundation laid in Zion" for a sinner's hope, and that their distance and alienation from one another in affection, is very much to be regretted. Many will not meet together on earth for the worship of God, who shall have one temple above, where all the faithful, "from the east, and from the west, from the north and from the south, shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of their" eternal "Father." But, after all, I must needs also believe, that it is possible to make shipwreck of the faith. This appears plainly from the following, as well as many other passages of Scripture: "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction," 2 Pet. ii. 1. If any take up false notions of God, or expect sanctification and eternal life in any other way than he hath pointed out in his word, though they may now build their hope on a fond imagination that he is such an one as themselves, they shall at last meet with a dreadful disappointment, in this awful sentence, "Depart from me, I know you not, ye workers of iniquity."

SECT. II.—There must be a discovery of the infinite glory of God.

In the second place, as there must be a discovery of the real nature, so also of the infinite glory, of God. He must not only be seen to be just such a Being as he really is, but there must be a sense of the infinite worth, beauty, and perfection of his character. These two things, though intimately connected, are yet so distinct from one another, as to deserve to be separately considered. The first is necessary, but it is not sufficient alone, or by itself. There can be no true religion, unless there be a discovery of the real nature of God. But though there be a knowledge of what God is, unless there be also a discovery of the excellence and glory of this nature, he can never be the object of esteem and love. It is one thing to know, and another to approve; and, whilst this last is not the case, whatever we may know, or affirm, or be persuaded of, with relation to the Supreme Being, we do not know him to be God, nor can possibly glorify him as God. This momentous truth we may surely comprehend, by what is analogous to it in our experience, between created natures. Speculative knowledge and love are by no means inseparable. Men may truly know many things which they sincerely hate; they may hate them even because they know them: and, when this is the case, the more they know them, they will hate them with the greater virulence and rancour. This not only may, but always must take place, when natures are opposite one to another, the one sinful, for example, and the other holy. The more they are known, the more is their mutual hatred stirred up, and their perfect opposition to each other becomes, if not more violent, at least more sensible.

We have little reason to doubt that the fallen angels, those apostate spirits, have a great degree of speculative knowledge. I would not, indeed, take upon me to affirm that they are free from error and mistake of every kind, yet it seems highly probable that they have a clear, though, at the same time, a terrible apprehension of what God is: for they have not the same opportunities, or the same means of deceiving themselves, that we have in the present state. But do they love him, or see his excellence and glory? Very far from it. They believe and tremble; they know God, and blaspheme. The more they know of him, the more they hate him; that is to say, their inward, native, habitual hatred is the more strongly excited, and the more sensibly felt.

The case is much the same with some

sinners when first awakened, and it continues to be the same so long as they are kept in bondage and terror. They have an awful view of the holiness of God's nature, of the strictness of his law, and the greatness of his power. This is directly levelled against their own corrupt inclinations, and carries nothing with it but a sentence of condemnation against them : " Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them," Gal. iii. 10. This brings forth their enmity, which before perhaps lay hid. It is remarkable, that some persons of loose and disorderly lives, will sometimes maintain, at stated seasons, a profession of piety. So long as they can keep their consciences still and quiet by general indistinct notions of God, as very easy and gentle, no way inclined to punish, they think of him without aversion, nay, will go through some outward forms with apparent satisfaction and delight. Their notion of Divine mercy is not a readiness to pardon the greatest sinner on repentance, but a disposition to indulge the sinner, and wink at his continuance in transgression. No sooner are such persons brought to a discovery of the real character of a holy God, than their thoughts of him are entirely changed. They have gloomy views of his nature, and harsh thoughts of his providence ; they fret at the strictness of his law, and, as far as they dare, complain of the tyranny of his government. Their sentiments are the same with those expressed by the men of Bethshemesh : " Who is able to stand before this holy Lord God, and to whom shall he go up from us?" 1 Sam. vi. 20.

I cannot help observing, that here we are, if I may speak so, at the very fountain-head of error. What is it else that makes many frame to themselves new and flattering schemes of religion? that makes them imagine a God so extremely different from that holy Being he is represented to be in his own word? When men will not conform their practice to the principles of pure and undefiled religion, they scarcely ever fail to endeavour to accommodate religion to their own practice. Are there not many who cannot endure the representation of God as holy and jealous, which is given us in Scripture? With what violence do they oppose themselves to it by carnal reasonings, and give it the most odious and abominable names? The reason is plain. Such a view of God sets the opposition of their own hearts to him in the strongest light. Two things opposite in their nature cannot be approved at once, and therefore the consequence is, God or themselves must be held in abhorrence. But we have reason to bless God, that their resistance to the truth is only a new evidence and illustration of it, shewing that " the carnal mind is enmity against God ; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be," Rom. viii. 7. And as this enmity to God discovers itself in opposition to his truth on earth, it will become much more violent when farther resistance is impossible. When an unregenerate sinner enters upon a world of spirits, where he has a much clearer sight and greater sense of what God is, his inherent enmity works to perfection, and he blasphemes like those devils with whom he must for ever dwell.

From all this it will evidently appear that there must be a discovery of the glory and beauty of the Divine nature, an entire approbation of every thing in God, as perfectly right and absolutely faultless. It is self-evident, that, without this, there cannot be a supreme love to God, in which true religion properly consists ; no man can love that which doth not appear to be lovely. But I farther add, that this is absolutely necessary to the very beginning of the change, or the foundation on which it is built. It is necessary, in order to any genuine, salutary convictions of sin. What is it else but a discovery of the spotless holiness, the perfect excellence, and infinite amiableness of the Divine nature, that humbles a sinner under a sense of his breaches of the Divine law? Without this, there may be a sense of weakness and subjection, but never a sense of duty and obligation. Without this, there may be a fear of wrath, but there cannot be a hatred of sin.

This seems directly to lead to the next great step in a saving change, namely, a conviction of sin and misery. But before we proceed to point out the progress of conviction, it will not be improper to take notice of a few truths which result from what hath been already said. This is the more necessary, as erroneous or defective views of religion are commonly occasioned by some mistake in the foundation.

1. The necessity of regeneration itself appears with peculiar force, from what hath been said on this part of the subject. There must be a real inward change of heart, before there can be any true religion. If the moral excellence of the Divine nature must be discovered, if God must be seen as glorious in his holiness, the heart and temper must be changed as well as the life. Nothing is more plain from the holy Scriptures, than that " the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God ;" and it is equally plain from experience and the nature of the thing. While men continue in the love of sin, it is impossible that they should see the beauty of infinite holiness. So long as they love sin, they must hate holiness, which is its opposite, and not less contrary to it than light is to darkness. Therefore all restraint upon our outward conversation, all zeal and diligence in expensive rites and ceremonies, all duties of whatever kind that arise from fear,

or other external motives, are of no consequence, till the temper and inclination of the heart is entirely renewed.

2. From what hath been said, we may plainly perceive that regeneration from first to last must be ascribed to the agency of the Holy Ghost. It must be the effect of Divine grace, and the work of sovereign power. Let not any creature be unwilling to stand indebted for his new creation to the Author of his first being; "for of him, and through him, and to him, are all things," Rom. xi. 36. While man is in his natural state, he is an enemy to God in his mind, by wicked works. The discoveries that are made to him of the real nature of God in his works and in his word, while he continues in this disposition, are not amiable, but hateful. Nay, he is so far from loving him as his father, that he fears him as his enemy. This fear will discover itself one of these two ways. Sometimes it will make the sinner fly from God, cast instruction behind his back, and increase unto more ungodliness, till natural conscience is seared and insensible. Experience is a melancholy proof how many there are of this kind, whom one crime only precipitates into another. It is worth while at the same time to observe what intimations are given us in Scripture, that this is the first and natural effect of sin upon all, to drive them at a farther distance from God. Two instances of this have been already given. Our first parents no sooner sinned than they fled, and hid themselves, when they heard God's voice in the garden, as impatient of his approach. A similar reflection we see in the Apostle Peter, on being witness to an extraordinary effect of his Saviour's divine power: "And when Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord," Luke, v. 8. See another instance of the same kind: "And the whole multitude of the country of the Gadarenes round about, besought him to depart from them, for they were taken with great fear," Luke, viii. 37.

Another common effect of this natural fear, in some respects contrary to the former, is to dispose men to perform some constrained and hypocritical services, in order to avoid punishment.

This is described in the temper and conduct of the children of Israel, as represented by the Psalmist: "When he slew them, then they sought him: they returned and inquired early after God. And they remembered that God was their rock, and the high God their Redeemer. Nevertheless, they did flatter him with their mouth, they lied unto him with their tongues; for their heart was not right with him, neither were they steadfast in his covenant," Psal. lxxviii. 34—37. Hence it appears, that to a discovery of the glory and excellence that is in God, it is necessary that we be in some measure changed into the same image. To say that this is the effect of our own attempts and endeavours in the way of duty, without the constraining power of Divine grace, is, when thoroughly examined, a manifest contradiction. If persons endeavour to force or oblige themselves to love any one, it is a sure sign that he is very unlovely in their eyes. Love cannot be forced, or rather, to speak more properly, forced love is not love at all. In a word, it is our indispensable duty to attend to every dictate of conscience, and to follow it so far as it goes; but I cannot help thinking, that for a sinner truly and sincerely to desire a change of nature, would be an evidence of a change begun. Therefore, till a sinner get a supernatural illumination, he can never see the glory and beauty of the Divine character. Before this, he may seek to propitiate God's favour, he may wish to avoid his wrath, he may desire a change in God for his own safety; but he cannot be satisfied with him as he really is. It must be the same Almighty power, which brought the world out of nothing into being, that must bring back the sinner from his rebellion and apostacy, according to that promise, evidently applicable to the Saviour: "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness," Psal. cx. 3. Neither is the same thing less clearly asserted in the New Testament; "For it is God which worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure," Phil. ii. 13.

3. Hence we may see wherein lies the fundamental essential difference between common or imperfect convictions, and the effectual sanctifying and saving influences of the Holy Ghost. The first arise from a view of the natural perfections of God, from a belief of his power and severity, without any discovery of his righteousness and glory. Therefore, however great a length they may proceed, however different or opposite their effects may be, they never produce any real change in the heart. It is of great consequence to attend to this important distinction, for though imperfect convictions sometimes are entirely effaced, and are followed by no lasting effect at all, yet it is often otherwise. They frequently produce a counterfeit religion, which not only continues for a time, but is carried down by some to the grave, as a lie in their right hand. So subtle are the deceits of Satan, that there are many hollow forms of religion, not only upon a legal, but an evangelical foundation. I shall give the reader a sketch of the principles and outlines of both.

There are some legal hypocrites. Awakened to a sense of their danger merely from the irresistible power of God, they fall to the exercise of repentance, and hope that by so doing they may live. Hence the whole system of bodily penance and mortification. Hence also so strong an attachment, in some worldly persons, to the external forms of religion, and veneration for the places of Divine worship. Being now somewhat more regular and decent in their ordinary carriage than before, they entertain a fond hope that all will be well. In the mean time, they are so far from being restored to the image of God, or being governed by his love, that all this is a burden to them; and indeed it is because it is a burden, that they are so prone to think it meritorious. Conscience checks them, and they dare not run to the same excess with others, or even repeat what they themselves did formerly; and, by this comparison, cannot help thinking they are in a hopeful way. But did such persons reflect a little on the nature of God, they would see their error. They would learn, that they are so far from being renewed in the spirit of their minds, that whatever lengths they go, they are dragged or driven against their will; and, whenever they can find a plausible excuse, they are ready to withdraw their neck from the yoke. A just view of the glory of God, and the obligation upon every rational creature to love and imitate him, would effectually cure them of all self-righteousness and self-dependence; would lead them to himself and the grace treasured up in his Son, to "work in them the whole good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power."

On the other hand, there are evangelical hypocrites. These begin upon the same principles, and their views have the same radical defect with the former. They are awakened to a sense of danger, and sometimes made to tremble through fear of Divine judgments, but without any discovery of the glory and amiableness of the Divine nature. If such persons happen to live in a family or congregation, where they hear much of the doctrine of redemption, it may have its place in their scheme. They may be so convinced of their own manifold transgressions, as to be satisfied to throw their guilt upon the Surety, and rely on the sufferings and death of Christ, for deliverance from the wrath of an offended God. Nay, I have not the least doubt that some may, by a confident presumption, imitate the faith of God's elect, and believe that Christ died for themselves in particular. So long as this persuasion can maintain its ground, it may and must give them great joy and satisfaction. Who would not find consolation in thinking themselves in safety from Divine wrath? Yet all this while they never see the evil of sin in itself, as an opposition to the nature, and a breach of the law of God. They are never brought to love an infinitely holy God in sincerity of heart. They may love him, because they suppose themselves the peculiar objects of his love, with some obscure, confused, sensual idea of the delights of heaven; but they know not, or consider not, the nature of that salvation which he hath provided for his chosen.

All such love, it is plain, ariseth from a false confidence in their own state, and not from a true knowledge of God. Their notions of God's love to them contain more of a partial indulgence to them as they are, than of his infinite compassion in forgiving what they have been. The effects of such religion are just what might be expected from its nature—violent and passionate for a season, and commonly ostentatious, but temporary and changeable. Self-love lies at the root, and therefore, while they are pleased and gratified, they will continue their profession of attachment; but when self-denial or bearing the cross is required, they reject the terms, they lose their transporting views, and return to their sins.

There are many examples of this not only in Scripture, but in the history of the Church in every age. Many of those disciples who seemed gladly to embrace the doctrine, and highly to honour the person of Christ, when they heard some of the most mortifying precepts, "went back, and walked no more with him," John, vi. 66. The character is little different which we find described under the image of the stony-ground hearers, who, "having not root in themselves, when persecution or tribulation arose because of the word, by-and-by were offended." I hope this, with the explanation above given of its cause, may be of use to account for some appearances in a time of the revival of religion. Persons who seem to have the same exercises with real converts, yet afterwards fall away, and "return with the dog to his vomit again, and with the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." This gives occasion to adversaries to speak reproachfully, and is greatly distressing to those who truly fear God. But, would men carefully attend to what the Holy Scriptures teach us to expect, their surprise in all such cases would cease. "For it must needs be that offences must come," Matt. xviii. 7. And, though there are many counterfeits, there will still be sufficient means to distinguish the gold from the dross."

SECT. III.—There must be a conviction of sin and danger.

THE next great step in a saving change is a deep humiliation of mind, and conviction of sin and danger. The absolute necessity of this is very evident, and indeed generally confessed. It is equally evident, whether we consider the nature of the change itself, the means of its production, or the motives to all future duty. If an entire change is necessary, there must be an entire and thorough dissatisfaction with, and disapprobation of, our past character and state. Whoever is pleased with his present character, will neither desire, endeavour, nor even accept of a change. If we consider the means of our recovery, by Jesus Christ suffering in the room of sinners, the same thing will appear with increasing evidence. Those who are not humbled under a sense of guilt and corruption will treat with great contempt a purchased pardon, and a crucified Saviour. This our Lord himself often tells us in the plainest terms. "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance," Luke, v. 31, 32. To these indeed his invitation and call is particularly addressed: "Come unto me, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," Matt. xi. 28.

To the same purpose we shall find many other passages, both of the prophetic and apostolic writings. The glad tidings of salvation are always directed to the humble, miserable, broken-hearted, thirsty, perishing soul. Thus, in the Prophet Isaiah, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters; and he that hath no money, come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk, without money and without price," Isa. lv. 1. When Christ entered on his personal ministry, he opened his commission in the following terms: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord," Luke, iv. 18, 19. I shall only mention one other passage: "I will give to him that is athirst, of the fountain of the water of life freely," Rev. xxi. 6.

From these passages, and many others in the same strain, it is evident beyond contradiction, that there must be a deep humiliation of mind, and sense of guilt and wretchedness, before a sinner can be brought unto God. This indeed hath ordinarily been considered as the first step towards conversion. In order to treat of it in the most clear, and, at the same time, the most useful manner, I shall divide it into two branches; and first, consider what is the true and genuine source of conviction or sorrow for sin; and secondly, to what degree it must be, in order to a saving change.

1. Let us consider what is the true and genuine source of conviction and sorrow for sin. And here we may observe in general, that, properly speaking, there can be but two sources of sorrow or humiliation of mind at all, namely, fear of suffering, and sense of the evil and desert of sin. Both these are found in true penitents; and it is their union and mutual influence that distinguishes repentance unto life from every counterfeit. Many have trembled through fear of punishment from God, and been dismayed at the tokens of his presence, who, notwithstanding, lived and died strangers to true religion, or any saving change. We see that even Judas, the traitor to his Lord, repented, confessed his sin, nay, did what he could to repair the wrong, throwing back the price of innocent blood; and yet he hanged himself in despair. The Scripture only farther says, "he went unto his own place;" but there have been few, if any, interpreters of Scripture, who entertained any doubt that it was the place of torment. We every day see that occasional danger, or the apprehension of immediate death, throws some into fits of terror, extorts from them confessions of guilt, or promises of amendment; and yet, in a little time, they return to their former practices, and sin with the same security, and perhaps with greater avidity, than before.

What is the essential defect of such seeming penitents? It is, that they have no just sense of the evil of sin in itself; they have no inward cordial approbation of the holiness of God's nature and law, or of the justice of that sentence of condemnation which stands written against every transgressor. Here, O Christian, is the cardinal point on which true repentance turns, and the reader may plainly perceive the reason and necessity of what was formerly observed, that there must be a discovery of the infinite glory and amiableness of the Divine nature. Without this, there may be a slavish terror, but no true humiliation. It is only when a sinner sees the unspeakable majesty, the transcendent glory, and infinite amiableness of the Divine nature, that he is truly, effectually, and unfeignedly humbled.

Oh! that I could deliver this with proper force! that I could write and speak under an experimental sense of its truth! The sinner then perceives how infinitely worthy his Maker is of the highest esteem, the most ardent love, and the most unremitted obedience. He then sees, that every intelligent creature, from the most shining seraph in the heavenly host, to the meanest and most despised mortal worm, is under an infinite, eternal, unchangeable obligation to love God, with all his heart, and strength, and mind. On this account he is convinced, that alienated affection and misplaced allegiance is infinitely sinful. He sees this obligation to be founded not merely nor chiefly on the greatness of Divine power, but on the intrinsic inherent excellence of the Divine nature. Therefore he is persuaded, that there is not only danger in rebelling against, or dishonouring God, but a great and manifest wrong and injustice in refusing to honour him. This strikes him with a sense of his own guilt, and the guilt of all those who live "without God in the world."

At once to confirm and illustrate this truth, I must make two observations, which will be found universally to hold, on the character and conduct of true penitents. 1. That they obtain a new sense of the excellence and obligation of the duties of Divine worship, both public and private. Before, they were apt to consider the duties of worship as little more than the means of religion; that the fear of an invisible Judge might be a bond upon the conscience, and keep men from fraud and dishonesty, or from riot and sensuality. They were cold and formal, therefore, in their own attendance, and never heard any speak of joy or sensible communion with God in his sanctuary, but they were ready to express their detestation of it as hypocrisy, or their contempt of it as enthusiasm and folly.

But now the language of adoration is in some measure understood, which had been wholly insipid and without meaning before. They join with the Psalmist in saying, "Honour and majesty are before him, strength and beauty are in his sanctuary. Give unto the Lord, O ye kindreds of the people, give unto the Lord glory and strength. Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name; bring an offering, come into his courts. Oh, worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness; fear before him, all the earth," Psal. xcvi. 6—9. See also those elevated strains of praise, which, whether they are meant as the exercise of the Church militant on earth, or the Church triumphant in heaven, are equally proper here: "And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him, and they were full of eyes within; and they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come. And when those beasts give glory, and honour, and thanks to Him that sat on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever; the four and twenty elders fall down before Him that sat on the throne, and worship Him that liveth for ever and ever; and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created," Rev. iv. 8—11. And to the same purpose: "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever," Rev. v. 11—13. Nay, a true penitent begins to see the beauty even of the Divine sovereignty; that all things belong to God, and therefore it is most fit that all things should be subject to him, according to that strong and beautiful passage: "And the four and twenty elders which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come, because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned," Rev. xi. 16, 17.

The other observation I am to make is, that a true penitent always acquires the deepest abhorrence of that atrocious, though prevailing sin, of profaning the name of God in common discourse. There are many persons, not otherwise the most abandoned, who have no just sense of the heinousness of this sin: and as it is not directly levelled against the temporal interest of our neighbours, it is far from being generally so scandalous and dishonourable as it ought to be. Such religion or virtue as is founded on worldly principles and views, may easily consist with its continuance; but he who is convinced of the evil of all sin, as rebellion against, and disobedience to God, will see the horrible guilt and impiety that attends this abominable practice. That religion which is the work of God's Holy Spirit, and consists in the recovery of his lost image, will never be able to bear so direct a violation of his sacred authority, so unprovoked an insult upon his honour and glory.

A fear of punishment, then, we have seen, without a sense of the evil of sin itself, is not sufficient. Let me now add, that this discovery of the evil of sin in itself, must increase our fear of punishment, by shewing it to be just. A fear of punishment while alone, always tempts the sinner to search about on all hands for arguments against that suffering, the justice of which he cannot perceive. Hence infidelity of heart and secret suggestions, that surely it cannot be that God will punish as he hath said. Hence blasphemous impatience. Hence rising thoughts and rebellion against God, even while under his rod; such as are described by the prophet Hosea: "And they have not cried unto me with their heart, when they howled upon their beds," Hos. vii. 14. Nay, hence sometimes the bitterest professed infidels among those who have been brought up in the knowledge of the truths of the Gospel, while they have never seen their beauty, or felt their power. But so soon as there is a discovery of the glory of God, and the universal and perfect obedience due from all to him, this throws a new light on the tokens of a Divine displeasure against sin, in the works of creation and providence. This carries home with irresistible force, all the threatenings of the wrath of God against sinners in his word. Their justice is then deeply and inwardly felt, and the sinner begins to wonder at the patience of a long-suffering God, that has not long ere now made him a monument of vengeance.

The same view it is that not only begins, but carries on and completes genuine convictions of sin, that silences all objections, and refutes the reasonings of the carnal mind. Every sincere convert will have, in a greater or less degree, the evidence in himself, that his change is of sovereign grace. He will probably be able to recollect in how many instances his mind set itself to oppose, and was at pains, as it were, to collect and muster up every objection against the obligation and sanction of the law of God. The objections are raised, first, against the necessity or benefit of obedience, and then against suffering for disobedience, till all are borne down by the same Almighty power which spake and it was done, and which can "lead captivity captive." I cannot propose to enumerate all the objections, or rather, all the forms in which objections may arise in the sinner's mind, when struggling against conviction; but I shall mention a few of them, and shew what it is that must put them to silence.

1. Perhaps the sinner will say, Alas! why should the law be so extremely rigorous, as to insist upon absolute and sinless obedience? Hard, indeed, that it will not admit of any transgression, any omission, the least slip, or failing, or frailty, but pronounceth so severe a sentence, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them," Gal. iii. 10. But consider, I pray you, what is the law, and who is the author of the law. The sum of all the commandments of the law is, "To love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength." Is this unreasonable? or is it too much? Is he not infinitely amiable, and absolutely perfect? Is he not the just and legitimate object of supreme love? Is not every defect of love to God essentially sinful? and can it be otherwise considered? He is a God of truth, who will not, and who cannot lie. He must therefore assert his own majesty and right, and say, as in the prophet, "Is there a God besides me? yea, there is no God? I know not any," Isa. xliv. 8. A discovery of the glory of God at once silences this objection, and shews that he asks but his due; and as he is the unchangeable God, any abatement in the demands of the law, not only would be unreasonable, but is in truth impossible.

2. Again, the sinner will perhaps say, "But why should the sentence be so severe? The law may be right in itself, but it is hard, or even impossible for me. I have no strength: I cannot love the Lord with all my heart. I am altogether insufficient for that which is good." Oh, that you would but consider what sort of inability you are under to keep the commandments of God! Is it natural, or is it moral? Is it really want of ability, or is it only want of will? Is it any thing more than the depravity and corruption of your hearts, which is itself criminal, and the source of all actual transgressions? Have you not natural faculties, an understanding, will, and affections, a wonderful frame of body, and a variety of members? What is it that hinders them all from being consecrated to God? Are they not as proper in every respect for his service, as for any baser purpose? When you are commanded to love God with all your heart, this surely is not demanding more than you can pay: for if you give it not to him, you will give it to something else, that is far from being so deserving of it.

The law then is not impossible, in a strict and proper sense, even to you. Let me next ask you, Is it unreasonable? Does he ask any more than all your hearts? and are they not his own? Has he not made them for himself? If not, let any rival rise up and plead his title to a share. Does he ask any more than that you should love him supremely? and is he not every way worthy of your love? If he commanded you to love what was not amiable, there would be reason for complaint. By tracing the matter thus to its source, we see the righteousness and equity of the Divine procedure, and that the law of God is eternal and immutable, as his own nature. Wherefore "let God be true, and every man a liar." All the attempts to impeach his conduct as severe, only tend to shew the obliquity and perverseness of the depraved creature, and not to diminish the excellence of the all-glorious Creator.

While men continue slaves to sin, it is absurd to suppose they should acquiesce in their Maker's authority; but so soon as any person discovers the infinite amiableness of God, and his obligation to love and serve him, his mouth will be immediately stopped, himself and every other sinner be brought in inexcusably guilty. He will see that there is nothing to hinder his compliance with every part of his duty, but that inward aversion to God which is the very essence of sin. It is of no consequence what your natural powers are, whether those of an angel or a man, a philosopher or a clown, if soul and body, and such powers as you have, are but wholly devoted to God. Do you say this is impossible? where then lies the impossibility of it, but in your depraved inclinations?

But we have not yet done with the objections: the most formidable of all is behind. Perhaps the sinner will say, How unfortunate soever this inclination may be, I brought it into the world with me; I derived it from my parents; it is my very nature; I am not able to resist it. This brings in view a subject far more extensive than to admit of being fully handled here. We may also easily allow, that there is something in it beyond the reach of our limited capacity: but whatever be the nature and effects, or manner of communicating original sin; whatever be the use made of it, in accounting for events as a general cause; if any voluntary agent hath nothing to offer in opposition to the strongest obligation, but that he finds himself utterly unwilling to obey, it seems to be an excuse of a very extraordinary kind. We are sure that no such excuse would be accepted by an earthly lawgiver; nor have we the least reason to think, any more regard will be paid to it by Him "who judgeth righteously."

In this, as in most other things, there is a wide difference between the sentiments of a hardened and a convinced sinner. The first, who hath no just view of the guilt of his actual transgressions, is always prone to extenuate them, by introducing original sin as an excuse for his conduct: but a sinner, truly convinced of the evil of his felt and experienced enmity against God, makes use of his early and original depravity for his farther humiliation. Thus the Psalmist David, when under the exercise of penitence for the complicated crimes of adultery and murder, expresses himself as follows: "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me," Psal. li. 5. In whatever way it was first introduced, it is certain that all aversion and opposition to God must be evil in itself, and the source of misery to him in whom it dwells; for all that "are afar off from him," shall certainly perish; and all that continue unlike to him must depart from him. Without perplexing ourselves with debates about the propriety or meaning of the imputation of Adam's first sin, this we may be sensible of, that the guilt of inherent corruption must be personal, because it is voluntary and consented to. Of both these things, a discovery of the glory of God will powerfully convince the sinner. When he seeth the infinite beauty of holiness, and the amiableness of the Divine nature, he cannot forbear crying out of himself, "Wo is me, for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts," Isa. vi. 5. As the impurity of his heart, so the irregularities of his life will stare him in the face; they never appear so hateful, as when brought into comparison with the Divine holiness; and if he essay to justify himself, his own mouth will condemn him as guilty from choice.

Once more, the same view will effectually confute and shew the vanity of those pretensions which are derived from our own imperfect and defective obedience. When conviction first lays hold of a sinner, however vain the attempt, he has still a strong inclination that righteousness "should come by the law." This is not wonderful; for in no other way can he himself have any title to glory, and a thorough renunciation of all self-interest is too great a sacrifice to be made at once. Hence he is ready to look with some measure of satisfaction on those who have been greater sinners than himself, and secretly to found his expectation of pardon for those sins he hath committed, on the superior heinousness of those from which he hath abstained. Hence also he is ready to hope he may make sufficient atonement for his past sins by future amendment: but a discovery of the holiness of God, and the obligation to love him with all the heart, and soul, and strength, and mind, soon destroys this fond imagination. It shews him that he can at no time do more than his duty; that he never can have any abounding or soliciting merit: nay, that a whole eternity, so to speak, of perfect obedience, would do just nothing at all towards expiating the guilt of the least sin. But besides all this, the same thing shews him, that his best duties are stained with such sins and imperfections, that he is still but adding to the charge, instead of taking from the old score; for "we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are but as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf, and our iniquities, like the wind, have carried us away," Isa. lxiv. 6. Thus, one after another, he is stripped of every plea, however eagerly he may cleave to them, and support or bolster up one by the addition of another. He sees not only his danger, but his guilt; not only the fearfulness of his state, but the holiness and righteousness of his Judge. He lies down prostrate at the footstool of the Almighty, and makes unmerited mercy and sovereign grace the only foundation of his hope.

Sect. IV.—Of the degree of sorrow for sin in true penitents.

Having thus considered the proper source of genuine conviction and sorrow for sin, it was proposed next to inquire, to what degree it must be, in order to a saving change. The truth is, were not this a question often proposed, and the solution of it desired by serious persons, the weakest of whom deserve all attention and regard from every minister of Christ, I should have left it altogether untouched. The reason of this observation is, that I am persuaded, and take the present opportunity of affirming it, that the chief distinction between convictions genuine or salutary, and such as are only transitory and fruitless, does not lie in their strength and violence, so much as their principle and source, which has been formerly explained.

There is often as great, or perhaps it may be safely said, there is often a greater degree of terror in persons brought under occasional convictions, which are afterward fruitless, than in others, in whom they are the introduction to a saving change. It is probable that the horror of mind which possessed Cain after his brother's murder was of the most terrible kind. It is probable that the humiliation of Ahab, after he had caused Naboth to be destroyed by false evidence, and was threatened with a dreadful visitation, was exceedingly great. It is probable that the mere passion of fear in either of these criminals was equal, if not superior, to the fear of any true penitent recorded in Scripture. It is the principle that distinguishes their nature, it is the differing principle that produces opposite effects. The one is alarmed, and trembles through fear of wrath from an irresistible and incensed God; the other is truly sensible of sin in all its malignity, and fears the sanction of a righteous but violated law. The one feels himself a miserable creature; the other confesses himself a guilty sinner. The one is terrified, and the other is humbled.

It is some doubt with me, whether in fruitless convictions there is any sense at all of sin, as such,—I mean as truly meriting punishment from a just and holy God. Such persons ordinarily are displeased at the holiness of God's nature, and murmur at the strictness of his law; and therefore, however much they may dread suffering here or hereafter, they cannot be said to be convinced of sin. We have seen some who, when afflictions brought their sins to remembrance, were but driven on by despair to higher degrees of guilt, and the more they seemed to fear the approaching judgment of God, only increased in the impatience of blaspheming rage.

However, as there is so great a measure of deceit in the human heart, some may be ready to flatter themselves, on the one hand, that they have seen the evil of sin in itself; and some, on the other, to fear that they have not seen it as they ought, because their sorrow has not risen to the requisite degree. Many have expressed uneasiness that they never mourned for sin in a manner corresponding to the strong Scripture declarations of its odious and hateful nature, or to the following description of gospel penitents: "And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and supplications; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born," Zech. xii. 10. For this reason I shall make an observation or two on the degree of sorrow for sin in true penitents, which may enable us to judge in every question of the same nature.

1. One thing in general must be carefully remembered, that we ought not to lay down one rule for all persons. We are not to measure the sorrow of any true penitent, and make a standard from it for the effects or expressions of sorrow in any other. The strength of all the passions, and their readiness to express themselves, is naturally greater in some than in others. There is nothing of which men may be more sensible from daily experience. Love and hatred, joy and grief, desire and aversion, show themselves by much more violent emotions in some than in others. It would be wrong, therefore, to reduce all to one rule, and none ought to look upon it as a just cause of disquiet, that they have not had the same degree or depth of distress and anguish which others have had, of whom they have read or heard. Another circumstance may also be the occasion of diversity. In some, convictions may have been more early and gradual, and, therefore, less violent and sensible. It is not to be supposed that Samuel, whose very conception was the answer of prayer, who was called from his mother's womb, and served in the temple from his being a child, should have experienced the same depth of humiliation with such as Manasseh, for example, who had been guilty of many atrocious crimes, and continued long in a hardened and insensible state. Therefore,

2. Suffer me to observe, that the great and principal evidence of a proper degree of conviction and sorrow for sin, is its permanency and practical influence. Genuine conviction is not a flash of fervour, however strong, but a deep, abiding, and governing principle, which will show its strength by its habitual power over its opposite. Every true penitent will join in these words of Elihu: "Surely it is meet to be said unto God, I have borne chastisement, I will not offend any more: that which I see not, teach thou me; if I have done iniquity, I will do no more," Job, xxxiv. 31, 32. Nothing else will be a sufficient evidence of penitence, where this is wanting; and where this is the case, nothing can be wanting that is really necessary. This may, perhaps, as I observed on another part of this discourse, be thought too general, but I am persuaded it is the only safe ground to build upon, according to the Scriptures. Every other claim of relation will be rejected at last by our Saviour and Judge, as he hath plainly told us, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not

prophesied in thy name, and in thy name have cast out devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity," Matt. vii. 21—23.

Would any know, therefore, whether their sorrow for sin hath been to the requisite degree, let me entreat them to suffer conscience to answer honestly to the following interrogatories. Has your conviction of sin been such as to make you abhor and hate it, in every form? Hath it been such as to make you resolve upon a thorough and perpetual separation from your once-beloved pleasures? Does it make you ready to examine the lawfulness of every pursuit, and to abstain even from every doubtful or suspected practice? Is there no known sin that you are desirous to excuse or palliate, studious to conceal, or willing to spare? Remember this necessary caution of our Saviour: "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell," Matt. v. 29, 30. Is there no sin, however long practised, or however greatly delighted in; is there no sin, however gainful or honourable, but you desire liberty from its enslaving power, as well as deliverance from its condemning guilt? Is there no part of the law of God, of the duty and character of a Christian, however ungrateful to a covetous heart, however despised by a scorning world, but you acknowledge its obligation? Would you, indeed, rather be holy than great? Do you rather choose persecution with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season? See what terms Christ makes with his disciples: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me; for whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for my sake, shall find it," Matt. xvi. 24. Upon the whole, instead of finding fault with the duty or lot of God's children, can you truly say, "O that there were such an heart in me, that I could keep his statutes! The law of the Lord is perfectly holy. The paths of the Lord toward me have been infinitely gracious. My heart only is exceedingly sinful. O Lord, write thy law in my heart, and put it in my inward parts: give me a new heart, and a new spirit, and cause me to walk in thy statutes, and keep thy judgments, and do them."

3. It is an excellent evidence of conviction being right both in principle and in degree, when the penitent hath a greater fear of sin than of suffering. As the great source of genuine conviction of sin is a sense of its evil in itself, rather than an apprehension of its consequences even in the life to come, there is no way in which this will discover itself more distinctly, than in the views we have of sin and suffering in the present state. Whether do you grieve most heartily for sin, or for worldly losses? Which of them do you avoid with the greatest solicitude and care? Will not this shew what it is that lies nearest your hearts, and hath the dominion there? Will not this shew it in a manner that must be convincing even to yourselves, and leave no room to reply? Alas! how heavy a sentence does this carry against many professing Christians! How great their anxiety about the things of time, how little about the concerns of eternity! How carefully will they observe the increase or decrease of their trade and opulence! But how little attention will they pay to the growth or decay of religion in their hearts! They will dread the arts, and fly from the society, of a fraudulent dealer, but will suspect no danger while their ears are drinking in the poison of licentious or impure conversation. The loss of a child, or the loss of their substance, oppresses them with sorrow; while even the commission of gross sin, if concealed from the world, produces a reflection scarcely felt, and speedily forgotten.

I have said, indeed, above, that all persons are not equally susceptible of violent emotions of any kind. But what shall be said of the same persons, who have the strongest passions on every other subject, and nothing but coldness and indifference in matters of religion? What shall be said of the same persons, who are easily and deeply affected with all temporal sufferings, and yet are but very slightly affected with a sense of the evil of sin; whose tears flow readily and copiously over a dying friend, but have no tears at all to shed over a dying Saviour? Does this at all correspond with the description given by the prophet "of mourning as for an only son;" in which penitential sorrow is compared to the most severe and exquisite of all human calamities. I must however, observe, that temporal sufferings are ordinarily attended and aggravated by sensible images, and are also sometimes sudden and unexpected, on both which accounts they may more powerfully call forth the expressions of sorrow and sympathy. But it is not difficult to judge which of them dwells most heavily upon the mind, which of them would be first avoided by the deliberate choice of the heart. Every true penitent does certainly see sin to be the greatest of all evils, and will discover this by comparison with all the other evils of which he hath at present any knowledge or experience.

4. I shall only mention one other evidence of conviction being to a proper degree—which

is, when a sense of the evil of sin is still growing, instead of diminishing. This will be found essentially to distinguish a sense of the evil of sin in itself, from a mere terror of God's power in taking vengeance on the sinner. Time gradually weakens the one, but knowledge, and even the mercy of God, continues to increase the other. When a sinner is brought under great convictions, it is a state so painful and distressing, that it cannot continue long. Some kind of peace must of necessity succeed. Either he stifles his convictions, hides the danger by shutting his own eyes, and returns to his former security and licentiousness of practice; or he does some things for a time, to quiet the cries of conscience, and lay a foundation for future peace; or, lastly, he returns to God through Christ, by true repentance, and continues to serve him in newness of life.

The first of these cases needs no illustration; the sense of sin in all such persons being not so properly weakened, as destroyed. In the second, the sinner is under great restraints for a season, but, when the terror is over, his obedience and diligence are immediately relaxed. This shews plainly, that he had no sincere or cordial affection to the law of God, but was afraid of his power. It shews that his convictions never were of a right kind, and, therefore, it is no wonder their strength should decay. But, in every true penitent, a sense of sin not only continues, but daily increases. His growing discovery of the glory of God points out more clearly to him his own corruption and depravity, both in its quantity and its malignity, so to speak. The very mercies of God, whatever delight or sweetness they afford, take nothing away from his sense of the evil of his doings, but rather melt him down in penitential sorrow. They serve to cover him with confusion at his own unworthiness, and to fill him with wonder at the Divine patience and condescension.

The first work of a convinced sinner is, to mourn over the gross enormities of a profligate life, or a life devoted to worldly pursuits. And his continued employment after conversion is, to resist and wrestle with that inherent corruption which was hidden from his view before, but becomes daily more and more sensible. So true is this, that I have known many instances in which the most genuine expressions of self-abasement happening to fall from aged experienced Christians, have appeared to others as little better than affectation. They were not able to conceive the propriety of these sentiments, which long acquaintance with God and with ourselves doth naturally and infallibly inspire.

From these remarks, let me beg the reader to judge of the reality and progress of the spiritual life. Does your sense of the evil of sin not only continue, but grow? Do you now see sin in many things which you never suspected before? Do you see more of the boldness, ingratitude, and sottish folly of sinners and despisers of God? Are you daily making new discoveries of the vanity, sensuality, and treachery of your own hearts? Be not discouraged at it, but humbled by it. Let it empty you of all self-esteem and self-dependence, and give you a higher relish of the gospel of peace. The substance of the gospel is "salvation to the chief of sinners, by the riches of Divine grace, and the sanctification of your polluted natures by the power of the Holy Ghost."

As I would willingly give as much information and instruction as possible, I shall, before quitting this part of the subject, speak a few words of a pretty extraordinary opinion to be found in some of the practical writers of the last age. It is, that genuine conviction, and the soul's subjection to God, ought to be carried so far in every true penitent, as to make him willing, satisfied, and some say, even "pleased," that God should glorify his justice in his everlasting perdition. This is so repugnant to nature, and to that very solicitude about our eternal happiness, by which the conscience is first laid hold of, that it appears to be utterly impossible. There have been many to whom this requisition has given inexpressible concern, has been a daily snare to their conscience, and an obstruction to their peace. There is such an inseparable connection between our duty and happiness, that the question should never have been moved; but, for the satisfaction of those who may have met, or may still meet with it in authors, otherwise deservedly esteemed, I shall make some remarks, which I hope will either explain it in a sound sense, or shew it to be at bottom false.

Men do often differ more in words than in substance. Perhaps what these authors chiefly mean, is no more than what has been explained above at considerable length, namely, that the sinner finds himself without excuse, his "mouth is stopped," he seeth the holiness of the law, he confesseth the justice of the sentence, he quits every claim but mercy. Thus he may be said to absolve or justify God, though he should leave him to perish for ever. So far, I apprehend, it is undeniably just; otherwise, the very foundation of the Gospel is overthrown, and salvation is not of "grace," but of "debt." If we impartially examine the word mercy, and the many strong declarations in Scripture of our obligations to God for the gift of eternal life, we shall find that they cannot, consistently, imply less, than that the sinner "deserved," and was liable to, "eternal death."

But to carry the thing farther, and to say that the penitent must be pleased and satisfied with damnation itself, as he is pleased with suffering in another view, as it is his heavenly Father's sanctified rod, appears to me to be at once unnatural, unreasonable, unlawful, and impossible. It is plainly contrary to that desire of our own happiness, which is so deeply implanted in our natures, and which seems to be inseparable from a rational creature. No such thing is, either directly or consequentially, asserted in the Holy Scriptures, which so often urge us to a due care of our own best interests: "Wherefore," says the prophet, "do you spend your money for that which is not bread, and your labour for that which satisfieth not? Hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness. Incline your ear, and come unto me, hear, and your souls shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David," Isa. lv. 2, 3. Farther, the proposition seems to me necessarily to imply an impossibility in itself. For what is damnation? It is to be for ever separated from, and deprived of, the fruition of God. Is this, then, a dutiful object either of desire or acquiescence? It is to hate God, and blaspheme his name, as well as to be banished from his presence. Can this be tolerable to any true penitent? or is it reconcileable to, or consistent with, subjection to his righteous will? Can any creature be supposed to please God, by giving up all hope of his favour? or is it less absurd than "disobeying" him from a sense of "duty," and "hating" him from a principle of "love."

We must, therefore, carefully separate the acknowledgment of Divine justice, and most unconditional subjection to the Divine sovereignty, from an absolute despair, or giving up all hope in the Divine mercy. We have a very beautiful Scripture instance of humble, yet persisting importunity, in the woman of Canaan, who met with many repulses, confessed the justice of every thing that made against her, and yet continued to urge her plea. Neither is there any difference between the way in which she supplicated of the Saviour a cure for her distressed daughter, and the way in which an awakened sinner will implore from the same Saviour more necessary relief to an afflicted conscience: "And behold a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou son of David, my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil. But he answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying, Send her away, for she crieth after us. But he answered and said, I am not sent, but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Then came she, and worshipped him, saying, Lord, help me. But he answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread, and cast it to dogs. And she said, Truth, Lord, yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table. Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt," Matt. xv. 22—28. I shall conclude with mentioning an instance of a similar character in a foreigner of eminent station, who had been a great profligate, and afterwards became a great penitent.* He composed a little piece of poetry after his conversion, the leading sentiment of which was what I have recommended above, and in his own language was to the following purpose: "Great God, thy judgments are full of righteousness, thou takest pleasure in the exercise of mercy: but I have sinned to such a height, that justice commands my destruction, and mercy itself seems to solicit my perdition. Disdain my tears, strike the blow, and execute thy judgment. I am willing to submit, and adore, even in perishing, the equity of thy procedure. But on what place will the stroke fall, that is not covered with the blood of Christ?"

SECT. V.—Acceptance of salvation through the cross of Christ.

THE next great step in a sinner's change is a discovery and acceptance of salvation from sin and misery through Jesus Christ. This is the last and finishing step of the glorious work. When this is attained, the change is completed, the new nature is fully formed in all its parts. The spiritual seed is implanted, and hath taken root; and it will arrive by degrees, in every vessel of mercy, to that measure of maturity and strength, that it pleaseth God each shall possess before he be carried hence.

It is easy to see that conviction of sin, which hath been before illustrated, prepares and paves the way for a discovery and acceptance of salvation by Christ. Before conviction of sin, or when conviction is but imperfect, the Gospel of Christ, and particularly the doctrine of the cross, almost constantly appears to be foolishness. Or if, as sometimes happens, education and example prompt the sinner to speak with some degree of reverence of the name, character, and undertaking of a Saviour, there is no distinct perception of the meaning, nor any inward relish of the sweetness, of these salutary truths. But those who have been "wounded in their spirits, and grieved in their minds," begin to perceive their unspeakable importance and value. That mystery which was hid from ages and generations, begins to open upon the soul in its lustre and glory. The helpless and hopeless state of the sinner makes him earnestly and anxiously inquire, whether there is any way to escape, whether there is any door of mercy or of hope. He says, with the awakened and trembling jailor, "What must I do to be saved?" Acts, xvi. 30. and with the Psalmist, "Innumerable evils have compassed me about; mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of mine head, therefore my heart faileth me," Psal. xl. 12. I have no excuse to offer, nor any shelter to fly to: the works, the word, and the providence of God, seem all to be up in arms against me, and have enclosed me as an enemy to him. O how fearful a thing it is, to fall into the hands of the living God! Who shall dwell with devouring fire? Who shall dwell with everlasting burnings? Is there no prospect of relief? Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there? Wonderful has been my past blindness! I have awaked as out of a dream, and find myself hasting fast to the pit of destruction. What would I not do, what would I not give, for good ground to believe that my guilt was taken away, and my peace made with God?

---

* Des Barreaux.

With what eagerness and earnestness, hitherto unknown, does the sinner now inquire after the way to life! With what solicitude does he "go forth by the footsteps of the flock, and feed beside the Shepherd's tents!" The Sabbaths, and ordinances, and word of God, are now quite different things from what they were before. No more waste of that sacred time in business or in play. No more serenity of heart, because he had been regularly and constantly at church, but an astonishing view of the sins of his holy things—careless, formal, heartless worship. He cries out with the Psalmist, "Lord, if thou shouldst mark iniquity, who shall stand?" No more indifferent, slothful, disdainful hearing the word. No more critical hearing the word, that he may commend the ability, or deride the weakness of the preacher. With what concern does he hang upon the sacred message, to see if there be any thing upon which he can lay hold! He then hears that "God is in Christ, reconciling the world to himself." The very news of salvation, the bare mention of pardon, is now a joyful sound. It rouses his attention, it awakens his curiosity, and he sets himself to weigh and ponder the important intimation. He hears that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved," John, iii. 16, 17. "Is there, then," says he, "hope of mercy with God, whom I have so long forgotten, and so greatly offended? Hath he indeed loved a guilty world? hath he loved them in so amazing a manner, as to send his only begotten Son to save them from destruction? How great is the Giver! how wonderful the gift! and how undeserving the objects of his love!"

Here perhaps a difficulty may occur. "It may be so," says the soul; "but are all the children of Adam the objects of Divine love? Shall every sinner be partaker of Divine mercy? Surely not. How then are they distinguished? Perhaps he intends only to save a few of the least unworthy, and to glorify his justice and severity in the condemnation of the most eminently guilty. What then have I reason to expect? None, none, none of any rank so criminal as I. I have sinned early, and I have sinned long. I have sinned against the clearest light and knowledge. I have sinned against innumerable mercies. I have sinned against the threatenings of God's word, the rebukes of his providence, the checks of my own conscience, and the unwearied pains and diligence of ministers and parents. I have burst every bond, and torn in pieces every restraining tie." How many gracious promises present themselves immediately, to extinguish this fear? "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow: though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool; if ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land," Isa. i. 18, 19. "Him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out," John, vi. 37. "Wherefore also he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him," Heb. vii. 25. "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come; and let him that heareth say, Come; and let him that is athirst come; and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely," Rev. xxii. 17. To these promises may be added many Scripture examples of heinous sinners, saved by the power of God, that none may despair. An idolatrous Manasseh, an unrighteous and oppressive publican Zaccheus, an unclean Mary Magdalene, and a persecuting Paul. Then is the soul brought to acknowledge and adore the matchless love of God; to repeat and adopt the words of the Apostle Paul. "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief."

The sinner in such a situation, is wholly employed in alternately viewing his own deplorable character and state on the one hand, and the sufficiency and efficacy of the remedy on the other. As these take their turns in his mind, his hope rises or falls. Perhaps, when he again reflects on the infinite number and heinous nature of his offences, when he considers the holiness and purity of God's nature and law, he is ready to bring all into question, and to say, "How can these things be? Is it possible that all this guilt can be passed by? Is it possible that it can be forgiven and forgotten by a holy

God? Is he not of purer eyes than to behold iniquity? Is it not said, that evil cannot dwell with him? that sinners shall not stand in his presence? How then can I presume to approach him? I, who have been so daring and obstinate a rebel? What reception can I expect to meet with, but, "Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth," Matt. xxii. 13.

To remove this distrust, and assure his heart before God, he is informed of the foundation of his hope, that salvation comes by a Mediator. He undertook our cause, he purchased redemption by his precious blood. Hear him saying in the councils of the Most High, "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened. Burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I come, in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart," Psal. xl. 6—8. Hear, also, in what manner he executed this gracious purpose: "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all," Isa. liii. 5, 6. Let us also see how this matter is represented in the New Testament: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus," Rom. iii. 25, 26. "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," 2 Cor. v. 21.

It is "through this man," and through his blood, that "repentance and remission of sins is preached to all nations." Is not this a sufficient and stable ground of hope? In the substitution of our Surety, we see a way opened for the reception and restoration of sinners, in a perfect consistency with all the Divine perfections. The spotless purity and holiness, the strict and impartial justice of God, seem to raise an insuperable obstacle to our admission into his favour; but in the sufferings and atonement of our Redeemer, we see how he may testify his abhorrence of sin, and punish it, and at the same time shew mercy to the sinner. There is a perfect harmony of all the Divine attributes in this design, and particularly a joint illustration of mercy and justice. This is the Gospel of Christ, the blessed and reviving message brought unto the world by the Prince of peace. This is "the record which God hath given of his Son."

How welcome, how reviving this, to the discouraged, convinced sinner! His very concern and fear, when proceeding upon proper grounds, arise from a view of the infinite evil of sin, so provoking to a holy God. But in this plan, laid by Divine wisdom, he sees the guilt of sin sufficiently expiated by a sacrifice of infinite value: "For we are not redeemed with corruptible things, such as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot," 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. He compares and contrasts, if I may so speak, the greatness of his guilt with the price of his pardon. Then appears, with new and uncommon force, the greatness of this mystery of godliness, GOD manifested in the flesh. A victim no less considerable than the eternal and "only begotten" Son of God, "the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person." What is it that cannot be purchased by this marvellous exchange? The believer sees, with adoring wonder, the justice of God more awfully severe, in "awaking his sword against the man who was his fellow," than if the whole race of offending men had been irrecoverably lost. At the same time he sees the unspeakable dignity and majesty of God, in his infinite and truly royal mercy, great in itself, and greater still in the way in which it is dispensed: "Herein is love indeed; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins," 1 John, iv. 10.

I cannot help here observing, that this salvation is so amazing, so wonderful in its nature, and so far removed from any thing we know among men, that we are in danger of being put to a stand, and can scarcely conceive it possible. But, on the other hand, when we consider that it carrieth not upon it any of the marks of human wisdom, we are naturally led to say, "Salvation belongeth unto God. His ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts." Therefore, when conviction of sin makes us feel the necessity, and discovers the glory of our Saviour's atonement; we may both rest assured of its truth, and triumph in its power. We may say with the Apostle Paul, "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth: who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us," Rom. viii. 33, 34.

But, "Pause a little, my soul," saith the convinced sinner, "what tidings are here? What saith the Scripture, Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? Unanswerable indeed! Happy, happy, thrice happy they, who are the objects of God's everlasting, distinguishing, and electing love. But how can I be sure that this includes, or rather does not exclude, me? Can I ever hope to read my name written in the Lamb's book of life?" No. But when you confess you cannot read any thing there in your favour, who hath authorized you to suppose any thing there to your prejudice? Secret things belong only to God. We are not permitted to search, and we are not able to comprehend or explain the infinite depth of the Divine counsels. But do not things that are revealed belong to us? And how shall we presume to set at variance the secret and the revealed will of God? Is not the commission sufficiently extensive? "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; and he that believeth not, shall be damned," Mark, xvi. 15, 16. Is not the call unlimited and universal? "Come unto me, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," Matt. xi. 28. "And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst," John, vi. 35. "And in the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink," John, vii. 37.

Can you then entertain any doubt of the call reaching to you, or question your title to rest upon this Rock of ages? Behold, we preach unto you Christ crucified, a despised Saviour, indeed, "to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness;" but the "power of God, and the wisdom of God, for salvation, to every one that believeth." There is no guilt so deep, but this precious blood will wash it out; no gift so great, but infinite merit is sufficient to procure it; no nature so polluted, but infinite power is sufficient to renew it. Shall we then any more withhold our approbation, or refuse our consent? Shall not every sinner, burdened with a sense of guilt or danger, intimate his compliance and urge his claim, and say, "Thanks, thanks be to God for his unspeakable gift. It is salvation by the death of Christ, and therefore becoming a holy and a jealous God, with whom evil cannot dwell. It is the same unchangeable God, who enacted the holy law, and who publishes this glorious gospel. It is salvation by grace, otherwise no child of Adam could have had any claim; and it is meet that the lofty looks of man should be humbled, and the Lord alone exalted in that day. It is salvation to the chief of sinners: I am the man. I hear my character clearly described in the word of God. I can read my name in the general and gracious invitation. I will accept of the offer, I will receive and embrace this blessed Saviour as my Lord and my God, as my life and my all."

Once more, perhaps the believer is still staggered, and his faith begins to fail. Astonished at the greatness of the mercy, "he believeth not for joy, and wondereth." He is ready to say, "Might I but hold fast this beginning of my confidence, I would not envy the greatest monarch on earth, his throne, his purple, or his sceptre, but would sing the new song put into my mouth, Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests to God and his Father, to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. But, alas! are not all the promises of salvation only in favour of them that believe? Here then the conclusion may fail. I am sensible of a lamentable weakness and backwardness of mind; and whilst I think I have no doubt of any of the truths of God, I greatly distrust the reality of my own consent and compliance with his will." Do you then really give credit to all the truths of God respecting your own lost condition, and the only way of deliverance from it? May the Lord himself increase your faith; for if it be so indeed, you are happy and safe. These truths, these alone, are the sure foundation of hope. I am afraid we have all too strong a tendency to look for some encouraging qualification in ourselves, on which we might more securely rest. What is faith? Is it any more than receiving the record which God hath given of his Son, believing the testimony of the Amen, the true and faithful Witness? Is not your peace and reconciliation with God, and the sanctification of your natures, expressly provided for in the all-sufficiency of Christ, and to him you are assured that you must be indebted for both? What standeth in the way of your comfort, then, but either that you do not give credit to the promise he hath made, or that you are not willing that he should do it for you? and this I acknowledge is both unbelief and impenitence.

Complain, therefore, no more, that you are afraid of yourselves, whilst yet you pretend to have the highest esteem of the blessings of redemption; on the contrary, say unto God, in a thankful frame of spirit, "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, and good-will towards men. I praise thee for this message of peace. I think I see, in some measure, its necessity, truth, and beauty. I see it, I trust, to such a degree, that it is the sole foundation of my hope. I renounce every other claim; nay, I abhor the thoughts of any other claim: Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith," Phil. iii. 8, 9. "It grieves me that there is such a backwardness in me to give glory to thy name, and to be indebted to the riches of thy grace. Subdue my obstinacy, and rule by thine own power. Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief."

SECT. VI. — How the believer recovers peace of conscience.

We have now seen in what way the believer is reconciled to God, and delivered from condemnation. It will not be improper, however, also to consider how he recovers peace of conscience, and how his heart and life are governed in his after walk. This will serve more fully to illustrate the influence and operation of the truths of the gospel There is even a necessity for doing so on two different accounts: 1. That, as has been shewn before at considerable length, every true penitent is deeply and inwardly sensible of the evil of sin in itself. He is not merely afraid of wrath, but sees the impurity and pollution of his own heart. Supposing therefore, will the intelligent reader say, this great distinction thoroughly established, his relief is but half accomplished. There may be no more condemnation for him in the law of God, for the breach of which satisfaction has been made and accepted; but he is only so much the more liable to the condemnation of his own conscience. He must still suffer the reproaches and challenges of his own mind, which make so great a part of the misery of a guilty state.

This receives additional strength from a second consideration, that as he is justified by faith, he hath peace only through the blood of Christ. This is not from himself, and may be thought to leave him, so to speak, in point of state and character, in point of pollution and defilement, just as before; nay, the extraordinary, unsolicited, undeserved grace of God, may be thought to increase his self-condemnation, and to set the malignity of his rebellion in the strongest light. And, indeed, so far this is true, that the free grace of God was intended, and does serve to produce a growing humiliation of mind and self-abasement, as well as an admiration of the love of God in Christ Jesus. As the tenderness of a parent is an image which God hath very frequently made use of, to shadow forth his own infinite compassion, I will borrow from it an illustration of the two remarks just now made. Suppose any child has offended a parent by a gross instance of undutiful behaviour, for which he hath been severely reproved, and for some time kept at a distance: if the parent forgives him, and receives him again into his favour, does not his being thus freed from the fear of suffering leave full room for his concern at the offence? And does not a sense of his father's love melt his heart more for having grieved such a parent, than any terror upon his mind for the punishment of the crime? He is immediately covered with confusion; and if there be in him any spark of ingenuousness, he is no sooner forgiven by his father, than the tide of his affections returns back with full force, and he can hardly forgive himself.

But, notwithstanding this, as Christ by his sufferings and death delivered us from the wrath to come, so by the shedding of his precious blood, the heart is also, as the Scripture expresses it, sprinkled from an evil conscience. On this important subject, which leads us to the great principles of the spiritual life, the following particulars are recommended to the serious attention of the reader.

1. Through Jesus Christ, and the whole of his undertaking as Mediator of the new covenant, the glory and honour of God are most admirably promoted, and perfect reparation made to his holy law which had been broken. This must needs be highly pleasing to every convinced sinner. As the justice of God is thereby satisfied, so conscience, which is God's vicegerent, and, as it were, pleads his cause, is satisfied by the same means. The ground of a sinner's dissatisfaction with himself, is the dishonour done to God. Must it not, therefore, please and satisfy him to see this dishonour so perfectly removed, and so much of the Divine glory shining in the work of redemption. All the Divine perfections appear there with distinguished lustre; and must not this be highly refreshing to the pardoned criminal? The very holiness and justice of God, which before were terrible to him, are now amiable. He also contemplates and adores the Divine wisdom, as it is to be seen in the cross of Christ. We are told, that even the celestial hosts have new discoveries of the wisdom of God in this great design of providence. "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God," Eph. iii. 10. How much more must the interested believer, with peculiar complacency, approve and adore it! But, above all, if that love and mercy which reigns through the whole is glorious to God, must it not be delightful to the Christian? God is love: and his tender mercies are over all his other works; but creating and preserving goodness are shaded and eclipsed by redeeming love. It is the theme of the praises of heaven, where Christ, as the object of worship, is represented as appearing "like a Lamb that had been slain."

2. Believers have peace of conscience through Christ, as their redemption through his blood serves for their own humiliation and self-abasement, for the manifestation of the evil of sin, and the vileness and unworthiness of the sinner. Nothing could be so well contrived as the doctrine of the cross, in its purity and simplicity, to stain the pride of

all human glory. We are particularly called to deny ourselves, and to derive our worth and strength from our Redeemer, in whom "it hath pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell," and from whose fulness all his disciples "must receive, and grace for grace." No hope of mercy but through him: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me," John, xiv. 6. "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved," Acts, iv. 12. No access to the throne of grace, or acceptance in worship, but through him: "In whom we have boldness and access with confidence, by the faith of him," Eph. iii. 12. "And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him," Col. iii. 17. There is no hope of stability in duty, of usefulness, or holiness of conversation, but by the continued exercise of faith in him: "Abide in me, and I in you; as the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing," John, xv. 4, 5.

Hard sayings and humbling doctrine, indeed! But this is appeasing to the conscience; for as conscience condemns us as guilty and undeserving, this condemnation is ratified in every particular by the Gospel. These very circumstances in this doctrine, which provoke the hatred, or invite the contempt of worldly men, do but so much the more endear it to the convinced soul; and he says from the heart, "It is highly just and reasonable that God alone should be exalted, and that he, through our Redeemer, should have the whole praise of our recovery and salvation." Agreeably to this, it will be found, that the apostles, in celebrating the grace of God, seldom omit an express condemnation of themselves, and a renunciation of all merit of their own, which, indeed, in every passage on this subject, is manifestly implied: "For by grace ye are saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast: for we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them," Eph. ii. 8—10. "Whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me, by the effectual working of his power. Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ," Eph. iii. 7, 8.

3. Believers have peace from the challenges of an evil conscience, through Christ, as they have an absolute assurance of being delivered from the power of sin, and effectually enabled to glorify him, with their souls, and with their bodies, which are his. This must be the most earnest desire of every convinced sinner. He breathes after deliverance from the bondage of sin: the more he has felt the weight of his chain, the more he longs to be free. This is inseparable from genuine convictions, on the principles above laid down. How much must it contribute to compose the conscience, to know that this desire shall certainly be accomplished! However much cause he may have to condemn himself for his past provocations, or to dread the weakness of his own resolutions of future amendment, he knows and trusts in the power of his Redeemer. He knows that henceforth he shall not serve sin, that its dominion shall be gradually broken through life, and entirely destroyed at death. As the end of Christ's coming was to glorify his heavenly Father, he knows that the glory of God cannot be promoted by leaving the sinner under the bondage of corruption, and therefore that he shall be purified, and made meet to be a "partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light."

If we look with care and attention into the New Testament, we shall perceive that there is a close and mutual connection between our justification and sanctification, and that both are represented as the fruit of our Redeemer's purchase: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit; for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death: for what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh," Rom. viii. 1—3. All the blessings of salvation are represented as following one another in a continued chain, or series, not one link of which can possibly be broken: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified," Rom. viii. 29, 30. There is a cleansing and purifying virtue in the blood of Christ, as well as an infinite value in the way of purchase and atonement: "For if the blood of bulls, and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God," Heb. ix. 13, 14.

None but real Christians, exercised in the spiritual life, know the value or necessity of the promises of strength and assistance contained in the Scriptures. The glory of their Redeemer's person, spoken of in such magnificent terms, both in the Old Testament and the New, is surveyed by them with the most exquisite delight. The power and efficacy of his administration is to them a source of unspeakable comfort. Under him, as the Captain of their salvation, they "display their banners," and go forth with undaunted courage to meet every opposing enemy, believing that they shall be "more than conquerors through him that loved them." Among many others, see the two following passages: "O Zion, that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain: O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength: lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God. Behold, the Lord God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him; behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him. He shall feed his flock like a shepherd; he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young," Isa. xl. 9—11. "Fear thou not, for I am with thee; be not dismayed, for I am thy God; I will strengthen thee, yea, I will help thee, yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness. Behold, all they that were incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded; they shall be as nothing, and they that strive with thee shall perish. Thou shalt seek them, and shalt not find them, even them that contended with thee: they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of nought. For I the Lord thy God will hold thy right hand, saying unto thee, Fear not, I will help thee," Isa. xli. 10—13.

SECT. VII.—How the Christian is governed in his daily conversation.

BEFORE concluding this Chapter, I shall speak a few words of the principles by which a believer is governed in his after obedience. On this the reader may observe, that a change in his whole character and conduct immediately and necessarily takes place. The love of God is "shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost," and is the commanding principle of all his future actions. It constantly discovers its influence, except in so far as it is resisted and counteracted by the remaining struggles of that "law in his members which warreth against the law of God in his mind." By the discovery which he hath obtained of the real nature and infinite amiableness of God, his will is renewed; he approves the things that are excellent, and gets such an impression of the obligation of the law of God as cannot be afterwards effaced. So long, however, as he continues under a load of unforgiven guilt, and sees every perfection of God armed with terror against himself, there can be little else than slavish fear: but when he hears a gracious promise of pardon; when, on examining the evidence, his doubt and uncertainty is removed; when he sees the righteous ground on which this forgiveness is built, he lays hold of it as his own, and is united to God by unfeigned love. This love, though weak in its measure, is, notwithstanding, perfect in its nature, and therefore powerful in its influence; being at once a love of esteem, of gratitude, and of desire.

The love of God is the first precept of the moral law, and the first duty of every intelligent creature; but it is easy to see, that unless our love is fixed upon the true God, it is spurious and unprofitable: and unless the true God is seen in "the face of Jesus Christ," for any sinner to love him is impossible: but through the glorious Gospel, the new nature is effectually produced, and cannot be produced in any other way. It is Christ Jesus who reveals to us the true God, the knowledge of whom we had lost: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him," John, i. 18. It is he who makes our peace with God, whom we had offended by our transgressions; for, "being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ," Rom. v. 1. And it is he who reconcileth our minds to God, by discovering his mercy to us; so that he might well say of himself, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me," John, xiv. 6.

I might easily shew, that the love of God is the source, the sum, and the perfection of holiness. All other duties naturally flow from it; nay, all other duties are nothing else but the necessary expressions of it. But instead of entering into a particular detail, suffer me only to observe these two things: first, that a believer is under the constant influence of gratitude to God; and secondly, that this includes in it, and will certainly produce, the most sincere and fervent love to all his fellow-creatures.

1. A believer is under the constant influence of gratitude to God, and that not of a common kind. It is not merely thankfulness to a bountiful and liberal benefactor, for mercies which have not been deserved, but a deep sense of obligation to a Saviour, who loved him, and washed him in his own blood from the guilt he had contracted; who saved him by his own death from the dreadful penalty which he had incurred. What the influence of this must be, we may gather from the words of the Apostle Paul, "For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead;

and that he died for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again," 2 Cor. v. 14, 15.

I cannot immediately drop this subject, but entreat the reader to observe how deeply a sense of redeeming love must be engraven on the heart of every believer. On how many circumstances will he expatiate, which serve to magnify the grace of God, and point out the force of his own obligations! The infinite greatness and glory of God, independent and all-sufficient, that he should have compassion on the guilty sinner, and say, "Deliver him from going down into the pit, I have found a ransom." Oh, how piercing those rays of love, which could reach from the Godhead to man! To this he will never fail to add his own unworthiness, his numerous, aggravated, repeated provocations. He never loses sight of those sins which first compelled him to fly for refuge "to the hope set before him." His own interest obliged him to remember them before, as exposing him to condemnation, and he is now willing to confess and record them, as serving to illustrate the Divine mercy.

And let us never forget the unspeakable gift of God, "That he spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all." How shall we sufficiently wonder at the boundless mercy of the Father, and the infinite condescension of the Son, when we reflect upon his incarnation, and on the astonishing end of his appearance in our nature, that he might "bear our sins in his own body on the tree." Did he overcome all his enemies in his last conflict, and "make a show of them openly, triumphing over them in his cross," and shall not he also, by the same means, reign in his people's hearts, and be the sovereign Lord of all their affections?

To all this, I shall only add that glorious inheritance, which is provided for every "vessel of mercy," after he hath passed his preparatory trials. How well may we join with the Apostle Peter in this solemn form of thanksgiving, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away," 1 Pet. i. 3, 4. Now, when all these circumstances are considered by the believer, together with such as may be peculiar to himself, and his own past conduct, must he not be ready to cry out, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? Oh, that I knew how I might repay some small part of my infinite obligations! Oh, that I knew by what means, or at what expense, I might magnify and do thee honour! Write thy laws in my heart, and put them in my inward parts, and enable me in every possible way to shew that I love thee, because thou hast first loved me."

2. This plainly includes in it, and will certainly produce, the most sincere and fervent love to his fellow-creatures. As love to God is the first, so love to man is the second commandment of the moral law. We have our Lord's own authority for saying it is "like" unto the first; and that love, which "worketh no ill to his neighbour," is the fulfilling of the law." Every one is ready to acknowledge, that love to man is an important branch of practical religion. But many great pleaders for this duty do not sufficiently attend to its inseparable connection with the love of God, and in particular, with a sense of redeeming love, or the love of God in Christ: yet is there no such principle of universal love any where to be found.

In order to take a short view of this, it will be proper to distinguish our brethren of mankind into the two general classes of bad men and good. As to bad men, the same love to God, the same concern for his glory, which fills the Christian with grief and indignation at their most daring offences, inspires the most ardent desire for their recovery and salvation. This is the only love to them, which is either acceptable to God or profitable to themselves. It will shew itself in all the offices of kindness and humanity; in instructing them where there is ability; admonishing them where there is opportunity; and in pleading for them at the throne of grace, to which there is always undisturbed access. The believer, knowing the danger of sin, and having a prospect of approaching eternity, is moved with compassion for blind and inconsiderate sinners. Their conduct leads him to reflect upon the depravity of his own nature, and earnestly to pray that they may be partakers of Divine grace.

He that loveth God is under little temptation to hate his brother; or rather, in so far as he loveth God sincerely, he is under none at all. Hatred commonly ariseth from envy and rival pursuits; but a Christian, more than satisfied with his own portion, hath no occasion to envy others, either what they possess or prosecute. In what a contemptible light does he look upon the honours, riches, and pleasures, about which there is so violent a struggle among worldly men! It is impossible, therefore, that he should hate those who do not interfere with him, though in many cases he is disposed heartily to pity their folly and delusion.

Nay, the matter does not even rest here, for the Christian is laid under the most express command to "love his" personal "enemies, to bless them that curse him, to pray for them which despitefully use him and persecute him." This is the glory of the Gospel, which gives the doctrine of Christ a lustre far superior to the most admired systems of human virtue. And, however hard a saying it may appear at first view, when we consider the character and hopes of a penitent sinner, and the example of his expiring Saviour, it hath nothing strange or incredible in it at all, that he, who expects from the free grace of God pardon for his innumerable and aggravated offences, should be ready to forgive the far slighter trespasses of his brethren against himself; or rather, that he should take the highest pleasure, and think it an honour, to do so, when he remembers his Redeemer's dying words, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

As to good men, there is no manner of difficulty: they are united together by the tenderest and the strongest ties, and love one another with a pure heart fervently. It was no wonder, that when Christianity was in a persecuted state, the heathens should make the remark, "Behold how these Christians love one another!" They had a common character, a common Saviour, common sufferings, and common hopes. And must it not be the same still? for "all that will live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution." If they are not persecuted with the sword, they shall be persecuted with the tongues of men. They have the strongest motives to love one another, and nothing to divide them, for there can be no rivalship or jealousy between those who possess or court the "true riches." There is enough in an all-sufficient God to satisfy the desires of all his saints; and they, being intimately united to the one only living and true God, must of consequence be united to one another. This is the tenor of their Saviour's intercessory prayer: "That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them: that they may be one, even as we are one. I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me," John, xvii. 21—23.

CONCLUSION.

I shall now close this discourse with some practical improvement of these important truths. Several reflections have indeed already been interwoven with the particular branches of the subject, and the light which they throw on other parts of religion pointed out. I shall therefore at this time only make a few observations upon the whole, and proceed to a serious address to all my readers on this most interesting subject. And,

1. From the various truths already established, and the order in which they have been opened, we may see the indissoluble connection between salvation by the grace of God, and holiness in heart and conversation. We may see their equal importance and their influence upon one another. There are many who attempt to divide those things which God hath inseparably joined. Many insist only on the duties of the law of God, and our natural obligations to obedience; and are hardly brought to any mention of the righteousness of Christ, as the ground of a sinner's acceptance before God. Nay, some scruple not to affirm, that the doctrine of justification by free grace, or a sinner's being found in Christ, not having his own righteousness, weakens the obligation to holiness, and tends to introduce licentiousness of practice. But, from what has been said in the preceding discourse, we may learn, not only in general the absolute necessity of a change, but how this stands connected with the purchase and gift of salvation, the character and work of a Redeemer. It will plainly appear, that a change in some respects is necessary to bring us to, and in others is the necessary effect and consequence of, the acceptance of salvation.

I have endeavoured in the preceding pages to shew, that a discovery of the nature and glory of God, and of the infinite evil of sin, is absolutely necessary, in order to our either understanding or relishing the doctrine of the cross. What is this, then, but a change begun? Must not the dominion of sin in every such person have received a mortal blow? Doth any thing more directly tend to holiness, than to see the power and glory of a holy God, and how "evil and bitter a thing" it is to depart from him? On the other hand, is it not necessary, to complete the change, that there be a sense of reconciliation and peace? "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" Can any person live in the love and service of God, while he conceives him to be his enemy, and supposes himself still the object of his wrath and displeasure? But, supposing this reconciliation obtained, let me boldly ask, what motive to holiness in all manner of conversation is equal to the force of redeeming love? Judge, O Christian, will any cold reasoning on the nature and beauty of virtue have such an effect in mortifying corruptions as a believing view of a pierced Saviour? Where shall we find so faithful, so active, so cheerful a servant of God, as one who joins with the Apostle Paul in saying, "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me," Gal. ii. 20. Faith in Christ Jesus never can take place in any heart, unless there has been an internal work of the Spirit of God testifying of him; and there is no effectual principle of new obedience, but faith which worketh by love.

2. What has been said above, will serve to explain some controversies with which the truths of the gospel have been often darkened and perplexed; particularly those relating to the priority, or right of precedency, so to speak, between faith and repentance. Some make repentance, that is, as they explain it, sorrow for sin, serious resolutions of forsaking it, and begun reformation, the joint grounds of our acceptance with the merit of a Saviour. These, with great plausibility, state the matter thus: That our sincerity is accepted through the satisfaction of Christ, instead of that perfect obedience to which we cannot now attain; and, when taken in a certain light, this assertion is undoubtedly true. Others, discerning the falsehood that may lurk under this representation, and fearing the consequences of every self-righteous plan, are tempted to go to the opposite extreme. That they might shew salvation to be wholly of grace, some have even presumed to use this harsh and unscriptural expression—that it is not necessary to forsake sin, in order to come to Christ. I could shew a sense in which this also is true, even as it is not necessary to forsake your disease in order to apply to the physician. But if it is not necessary to forsake it, I am sure it is necessary, in both cases, to hate it, and desire deliverance from it.

This difficulty will be easily solved from what has been said in the preceding parts of this treatise, and we may learn to preserve the truth, without exposing it to the scorn or resentment of its enemies. The reader may observe, then, that none can see the form or comeliness of a Saviour standing in the room of sinners, and purchasing forgiveness from a holy God, till the glory of this God is discovered, till the guilt of sin lays hold of the conscience, and its power is both felt and lamented. This may, perhaps, be called repentance, and I believe it is called so sometimes in the Holy Scriptures, particularly in the following passage: "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord," Acts, iii. 19. But the sinner does not so properly forsake sin in order to come to Christ, as he flies to him for deliverance from its condemning guilt and enslaving power. He is so far from coming to God with a gift in his hand, even of his own prayers and penitential tears, that his convictions continue to follow him, if I may speak so, through every lurking-place, till he is entirely subjected, till he is stripped naked and bare, and deprived of every shadow of excuse. Then it is that salvation through a despised crucified Saviour becomes unspeakably amiable in all its parts, sin becomes more perfectly hateful, and an assured prospect is obtained of its immediate mortification, and, in due time, of its entire and complete destruction. Thus faith and repentance are involved in one another; they produce, and are produced by one another. They may be treated of distinctly, but they cannot exist separately. So that whenever either of them is found alone, or stands independent of the other, that very thing is a sufficient evidence that it is false and spurious.

3. From what has been said on this subject, we may be enabled to judge what are the fundamental and essential doctrines of the gospel, to which all others are but subordinate and subservient. Regeneration, or the new birth, we are warranted to say, after the example of our Saviour, is absolutely necessary to salvation: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." If any man, therefore, depart from this truth, he makes shipwreck of the faith, and will at last be found to fight against God. It is also plain, that the reconciliation of a sinner to God must be through the blood of the atonement: for other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ," 1 Cor. iii. 11. If any man hold by, and build upon this great foundation, he shall be finally accepted, though many things may be found in him justly blameworthy. Nor is it easy, indeed, to say what degree of error and misapprehension concerning these truths themselves, may be consistent with abiding by the substance. But certainly all who directly and openly oppose them, may be said "to bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and to bring upon themselves swift destruction," 2 Pet. ii. 1.

This may teach us, what judgment Christians ought to form of the many parties and factions which divide the visible Church. There may be smaller differences, which keep them asunder on earth, while, in faith and in love to an unseen Saviour, they are perfectly united. We are told that God shall gather his elect from the four winds, and that "many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven," Matt. viii. 11. I always think with much pleasure on the perfect union of this great and general assembly of the church of the first-born. Then all other distinctions, all other designations, shall be abolished, and those shall make one pure and unmixed society, who have received "a white stone and a new name," and "whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life." The prospect of this should keep us from immoderate resentment, at present, against any who, as we have reason to think, hold the foundation, are acquainted with real and practical religion, or have had experience of a saving change.

No man, indeed, can deny it to be just, that every one should endeavour to support that plan of the discipline and government of the church of Christ, and even the minutest parts of it, which appears to him to be founded upon the word of God. But still, sound doctrine is more to be esteemed than any form. Still we ought to consider the excellence of every particular form, as consisting in its fitness to promote or preserve the knowledge of the truth, and to carry on a work of illumination, conviction, and conversion, to the saving of the soul. Would any Christian shew that he is of a truly Catholic disposition, let him discover a greater attachment to those even of different denominations, who seem to bear the image of God, than to profane persons, be their apparent or pretended principles what they will. Let us pay some regard to other distinctions, but still the greatest regard to the most important of all distinctions, that of saints and sinners.

4. As this great distinction divides the whole human race, and is so very important in its consequences, let me earnestly entreat every one who peruses this treatise, to bring the matter to a trial with regard to himself. Answer this question in seriousness, Whether do you belong to the one class or the other? We are dropping into the grave from day to day, and our state is then fixed beyond any possibility of change. What astonishing folly to continue in uncertainty whether we shall go to heaven or hell, whether we shall be companions of angels, or associates with blaspheming devils, to all eternity! Nothing, therefore, can be more salutary, than that you make an impartial search into your present character and state. If you have ground to conclude that you are at peace with God, what an unspeakable source of joy and consolation! If otherwise, there is no time to lose in hastening from the brink of the pit. May I not with some confidence make this demand of every reader, that he would set apart some time, and apply with vigour and earnestness to the duty of self-examination. Is not this demand reasonable? What injury can you suffer by complying with it? Will conscience permit any to continue unreproved in the neglect of it? Have you read so much on the subject of regeneration, and are you unwilling to reap the benefit of it? Let every one, without exception, take up or renew this grand inquiry, "Am I in Christ? that is, am I a new creature or not? Am I a child of God? or do I still continue an heir of hell?"

5. As it is more than probable there will be some readers who are, or have reason to suspect themselves, unrenewed, I would now come as an ambassador from Christ, and endeavour to negotiate peace. Wherefore "as though God did beseech you by me, I pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled unto God," 2 Cor. v. 20. While I attempt this, I desire to do it under a just impression of the great and principal truths which have been illustrated on this subject. I know that this change is a work of the Holy Spirit of grace; that he only can bring a clean thing out of an unclean; that without his effectual blessing, the clearest and most conclusive reasoning directed to the understanding, the most warm and pathetic application to the affections, will be altogether fruitless. I know that great natural abilities are often perverted and abused, that the soundest reason in worldly things, and the most brutish folly in matters of eternity, are often joined together. That men may be learned scholars, eminent politicians, active merchants, skilful tradesmen, and yet blinded sinners, whom no instruction can enlighten, whom no warning can alarm. But I know and believe, at the same time, that God, "whom I serve with my Spirit in the gospel of his Son," is able to make "his word quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart," Heb. iv. 12. There is an express appointment, that the wicked shall "receive warning," and in this way alone the watchman can "deliver his own soul." It is also agreeable to reflect, that when God giveth "a door of utterance," he is also often pleased to give "a door of faith," which I pray may be the case with many who read this discourse, for Christ's sake.

Let me, therefore, repeat in your ears this truth, and may God Almighty, by his Spirit carry it to your hearts, that "except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Every child of Adam, by nature, is at enmity with God, and must either be renewed in the spirit of his mind, or perish eternally. It is of no consequence what you are as to outward station, if you are not reconciled to God; it is of no consequence what you are as to outward profession, if you are not inwardly changed. God is no respecter of persons, and therefore, whether you are high or low, rich or poor, whether you are of one denomination of Christians or another, if you have not been the subjects of a renewing and sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit, you are children of wrath, and, if you die in that condition, must "go away into everlasting punishment." To reflect seriously but for a few moments on this truth, and that every one of us is so deeply concerned in it, one would think might be sufficient to alarm us all, either for ourselves, or for others, or for both. Who could imagine that this weak flesh, so frail in its nature, and so easily taken to pieces, should yet so harden us against the impression of approaching eternity? But is there any hope of relief? Yes, there is, and that as universal as the danger. The commission is unlimited, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," Mark, xvi. 15.

In order to make this exhortation the more distinct and effectual, I shall endeavour to address it in a particular and separate manner to the following classes: the rich and the poor; the young and the old; the self-righteous and the chief of sinners.

1. I would preach the everlasting gospel to the rich and affluent, on whom (as the world chooses to express it) fortune smiles, who are well and plentifully supplied with every present conveniency. The prophet Jeremiah, in trying the success of his message, says, "I will get me unto the great men, and will speak unto them," Jer. v. 5. It is, indeed, often a matter of no small difficulty to persuade such to hear the truths of the gospel. Let them not be offended while I mention the words of our blessed Saviour: "Verily, I say unto you, that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. And again, I say unto you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God," Matt. xix. 23, 24. When the world is pleasant and inviting, it is ready to engross our attention, to possess our esteem, and to attract our homage. Worldly grandeur is very ready to inspire the mind with pride and self- sufficiency, which is, of all other things, the most destructive of real religion, and which is particularly opposite to the humbling and self-abasing doctrine of salvation by grace. The great and fashionable world is still in danger of the offence of the cross. Denying themselves, bearing profane scorn, mortifying the flesh, loving and following a crucified Master, are hard lessons indeed, to men of wealth and affluence.

But suffer me to warn all such not to "trust in uncertain riches." Place not your happiness in so unstable a possession. How strong, as well as how just, the wise man's expressions! "Wilt thou set thine eyes upon that which is not? for riches certainly make themselves wings, they fly away as an eagle towards heaven," Prov. xxiii. 5. Behold, I preach the gospel to you, and offer you the true riches. However pride may make you fondly flatter yourselves, however your greatness or wealth may deter others from treating you with plainness and sincerity, you are sinners of the race of Adam; you are lost in him by nature; you are transgressors in practice, and liable to Divine wrath, from which there is no shelter but in the blood of Christ. It is but a very little time that your worldly greatness can endure. Death shall write vanity on all created glory; and nothing else shall screen you from the wrath of the Almighty Judge in the last and great day. There the rich and the poor, the prisoner and the oppressor, shall stand upon a level before the Maker of them all. Embrace, then, while you may, the mercy of God. Put on the spotless robe of your Redeemer's righteousness, and value it more than purple and fine linen, or the most costly attire. Seek the bread of life which came down from heaven, and value it more highly than the most sumptuous and delicate fare. Be not ashamed of a crucified Saviour. Endure with a noble firmness the disdainful smiles of a scoffing world. O! how amiable is the union of high station and piety, honour and humility, wealth and self-denial, with a resolute profession of the gospel! Blessed is the memory of Joseph of Arimathea, an honourable man, and a counsellor, who boldly begged, and honourably interred, the body of our Lord, after it had been crucified at the instigation of corrupt priests, and pierced by the inhumanity of brutal soldiers. May the Lord God of nature bless and increase your substance, and make every thing you do to prosper, but in his mercy deliver you from despising the gospel, dying impenitent, and lifting up your eyes in torment.

2. Let me preach this gospel to the poor. It was the glory of the gospel that it was preached to the poor, and given by our Saviour himself as one of the marks of the Messiah's arrival, that "the gospel was preached to the poor." Very suitable was this to their state, good news were brought to them in their distress. But think not, my brethren, that your being poor is enough of itself. It may, indeed, preserve you from many temptations to which the rich are exposed, and it ought, one would think, to constrain you to seek to be rich towards God. But, alas! this is not always the case, and, when it is otherwise, how does it make every considerate heart bleed with compassion and tenderness! Oh! unhappy they who are both poor and profane, miserable in time, and miserable to eternity, despised on earth, and outcasts for ever. Pitiable case indeed!

But does not the Saviour of sinners beseech you to be reconciled unto God? He entreats you to come unto him, that you may have life. He regardeth not the persons of men, but values a precious immortal spirit as much in a mean cottage as in a splendid palace. Your rags and nakedness can be no hinderance to your obtaining his favour. He counsels you to "buy of him gold tried in the fire, that you may be rich; and white raiment, that you may be clothed." But, oh! consider that you are naturally much more loathsome by sin than by poverty. Humble yourselves deeply in the sight of God. Fly for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before you. Accept of a free pardon of all your sins through the blood of Christ, and of his Holy Spirit to enable you to love and serve him. Rejoice in your portion as all-sufficient and full, and in the covenant of peace, as "ordered in all things, and sure." Go, in the spirit of adoption, to your reconciled Father in Christ, and ask of him your daily bread. Do not envy the prosperity of others, since it is not material whether you shall live in plenty and sleep on a bed of down, or live in straits and lie on a dunghill, compared to what shall become of you for ever. But, above all, be not so mad as to envy sinners an unsanctified prosperity. Rather, when you see a man of opulence despising the Sabbath, or hear a blasphemer in a gilded chariot profaning his Creator's name, be ready to say, "Shall I complain of poverty, when my Lord and Master had not where to lay his head? No, let me, on the contrary, bless that adversity which caused me to consider. Let me be very thankful for that humble station which gives me access to communion with God, and does not waste my time with crowds of company. Who knoweth whether I should have retained my integrity, if I had been constantly surrounded with profane gaiety, swimming in pleasure, besieged by flatterers, solicited by sensualists, beset with temptations! Oh that I may be possessed of the pearl of great price, reconciled to God, united to Christ, adorned with Divine grace, and that I may be my Redeemer's at his second coming."

3. I would preach the gospel to those who are but yet in the morning of life. This is the most pleasant and hopeful part of a minister's work. Happy are you, my dear children, who have been so early called into God's vineyard, but infinitely more happy, if you are inwardly and fully determined to comply with the call. I beseech you, "Remember your Creator in the days of your youth, while the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh, when you shall say you have no pleasure in them," Eccles. xii. 1. Early piety is exceeding lovely in the eyes of the sober part of mankind, highly acceptable to God, and will be infinitely profitable to yourselves. Be not enticed with the deceitful promises and false pretences of worldly enjoyments, which are so ready to inflame your passions, and so warmly solicit your love. Believe the testimony of all, without exception, who have gone before you, and have left this record written on created comforts, that they are "vanity and vexation of spirit." Believe it, you have entered on a world of sin and sorrow. You may feel the early stirrings of corruption in yourselves, and see its manifest and manifold fruits, both in yourselves and others. Alas! are there not some young persons who learn, as their first language, to blaspheme their Maker's name? Many children who cannot work, are expert in sinning. Alas! your hearts are naturally far from God; you "go astray as soon as you are born, speaking lies."

Be persuaded, therefore, to fly to the blood of Christ, the precious blood of Christ "who loved you, and gave himself for you." He died upon the cross, to save you from the hell which you have deserved by your sins; and he graciously invites you, saying, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God," Mark, x. 14. Blessed are those children, who, like their Saviour, advance in wisdom as in stature, and "in favour with God and man." Let young persons in general remember, as they are growing up, especially such as have been brought up under the inspection of pious parents, that all the early opportunities of instruction which they have enjoyed will greatly aggravate their guilt, if they continue to despise them. For this reason some, I wish I could not say many, are old in sin, when they are but young in years. Wherefore, without farther delay, betake yourselves to God in Christ; learn and love your Redeemer's name, and let the life that you live in the flesh, be a life of faith on the Son of God and only Saviour of the world. Your early entrance on a religious life will make you regular, established, useful, fruitful Christians. If you are to continue long in the world, it will greatly contribute to the sweetness and serenity of life; and if it be the will of God that you should die soon, it will make you meet for the inheritance of the saints in light. There is something very terrible in the death (often the unexpected death) of young persons, in the bloom or middle of life, plunged in sensuality, inflamed with lust, and bent on sin of every kind. But, blessed be God, there are also some agreeable instances of young saints quickly ripened by Divine grace, thoroughly mellowed by early affliction, resigning the world, not with submission only, but pleasure, and taking wing to a land of rest and peace, where "the inhabitants shall not say, I am sick;" and "the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity," Isa. xxxiii. 24.

4. I must now preach the gospel to those who are old, who, having gone through many vicissitudes, are perhaps tottering upon the brink of the grave, and drawing near to "the house appointed for all living." And I do it, because my office obliges me to preach the gospel to every creature. There is but little pleasure in addressing such, because there is but little hope of success. May I not suppose, that some one, or more, may be led to peruse this discourse, who have many years resisted the calls of the gospel, and have been long accustomed to do evil? What cause have you to admire the mercy of God, that you

are not now "in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone for evermore!" Have you not followed many of your equals in age to the church-yard, and committed their bodies to the dust? What preparation have you made in consequence of the reprieve allowed you, and the admonitions given you? Hear then, once more, the joyful sound: Believe in the name of the Son of God, that you may have life through his name. Fly to his blood, that you may obtain the forgiveness of your sins, and an inheritance among them who are sanctified. He, and none else, is able to deliver you. Cry to him, that he may breathe upon the dry bones, and they shall live. Though you are hardened in profanity, though you are besotted in sensuality, though earthly-mindedness has overspread you like a leprosy, his right hand and his holy arm will get him the victory. He is able to create you anew unto good works; and, as you are already monuments of his patience and forbearance, to make you to eternity the happy monuments of his sovereign and almighty grace. Is there now any remaining objection? Is there yet any room for farther delay? Hath not time shed its hoary hairs upon your heads, and drawn its furrows upon your brows? Make haste, then, and fly for your lives, lest you lie down in sorrow, and make your bed in hell.

5. Let me preach the gospel to the self-righteous. By the self-righteous, I mean those who trust in an outward lifeless form of duties, in a character formed upon worldly prudence, and a few of the most common offices of civility between man and man; especially those, if any such have persisted in reading this discourse to the close, who despise the doctrines of the grace of God. Do any of you lean to the fashionable scheme of irreligious, pretended morality; and when you are at liberty, treat the doctrine of free grace, and of Christ's righteousness and merit, with contempt and scorn? As the full soul loatheth the honeycomb, so the self-righteous soul spurns at the riches of Divine mercy, and likes not the incessant repetition of the name of Christ. Your guilt is of the darkest and deepest dye. Your danger it is impossible to conceive or express. What views have you in drawing near to a holy God in solemn worship? Or what meeting do you expect with God, when he sitteth upon the throne of his holiness in the day of judgment? Do you ever, though in the slightest manner, make conscience of the duty of self-examination? May I not have some hold of you by that quarter? What satisfaction have you in your own hearts? Dare you tell us now what passes there? Oh, the power of self-deceit! You would be covered with confusion, did but the world know the foul pollution that lodges within you: how much less shall you be able to stand the strict and impartial judgment of the great Searcher of hearts?

Do but open the book of God, and what page will not condemn you? This sentence stands uncancelled against you, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them. Out of your own mouths will you be judged, ye wicked servants. Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God?" Bring forth your boasted morality, and let it be put to the trial. Will you, or dare you say, "I have loved the Lord with all my heart, with all my soul, with all my mind, and with all my strength?" Will you say, I have loved his worship, and served him in public, in my family, and in secret, and I hope he will accept of it? I think I am authorized to answer in his name, "Was it worshipping me, to be singing psalms with your mouths, and not once remembering their meaning? to be thinking of a hundred vain things, when you were in the house of God? to be praising without thankfulness, confessing without sorrow, and asking blessings without desiring them; and to be more attentive to the faces and dresses of others around you, than to the frame of your own hearts? Was it hearing my word, to be criticizing the style and manner of the speaker, and laying hold, with the utmost eagerness, of every improper motion or ill-chosen expression, as a fund of entertainment for yourselves and your companions over your cups and bowls? Or do you call your careless, hasty, drowsy prayers, with long intermissions, worshipping me in secret?"

But, perhaps you will rather choose to trust to the duties of the second table, and what you owe to your neighbour. Perhaps you will say, I have been honest in all my dealings, and never wronged any man; nay, I have been kind and charitable, have dealt my bread to the hungry, and supplied the wants of the afflicted and poor. I answer, in the name of God, "Many have been your defects, even in these duties; but, supposing it to be so, you have not feared me. It might be from pride, from fear of censure, from prudence; but it was not in obedience to me, for I was not in all your thoughts. Was it your duty to your neighbour to make a mock at his sins, to lead him into intemperance, to despise him in your hearts, and ridicule him in your conversation?" In one word, do but examine all your righteousnesses, they will be found "as filthy rags" before God. Trust not in such a "refuge of lies—The bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it," Isa. xxviii. 20. Believe it, there is no salvation in any other than in Christ. His atoning blood will reconcile you to God; his grace and love will captivate your souls; his holy and blessed Spirit will write his laws in your hearts. Believe in him, and you will be more holy than ever, and yet stand astonished at your profane and blind pride and vanity. He will create in you a clean heart, and you will then blush at the thought of your remaining pollution. You will apply yourselves to his service with zeal and diligence, and yet still say you are unprofitable servants. One view of the cross of Christ will make sin more odious than a thousand fine descriptions of the beauty of virtue, which commonly serve only to nourish and fortify the pride of man. If ever you desire to see the face of God in mercy, or to dwell in his presence, believe in Christ, for there is no other way to the Father.

6. In the last place, suffer me to preach the gospel to the chief of sinners. It is the glory of our Redeemer, that he saves "to the uttermost all that come to God by him." The dignity of his person, the greatness of his sufferings, and the infinite value of his atonement founded on both, makes him "mighty to save." Let such sinners attend to this, who are without excuse, whose hearts have been a sink of the greatest impurity, whose lives are stained with the foulest and the grossest crimes, whose sins have been numerous, and heinous, and scandalous; who have no plea to offer, but are sensible that they have justly merited the wrath of God in its utmost rigour. Let such attend to this, as are trembling at the thoughts of a righteous judgment, and saying, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.—Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Behold, I bring you good tidings of mercy unmerited, pardon unsolicited, a full and free remission of all your sins. "I have blotted out thine iniquities as a cloud, and as a thick cloud thy sins: return unto me, for I have redeemed thee," Isa. xlii. 22. Receive this testimony, and "set to your seal that God is true."

Think not to do injury to the grace of God, by weaving a self-righteous cobweb, and refusing to believe, till you have laid down some rules of a new life, and effected some partial reformation, as if you would first save yourselves, that you may be fit for salvation by Christ. These hopes will soon be dashed in pieces. Faith in the imputed righteousness of Christ is the sinner's only plea. The more vile you are in your own apprehension, the more need you have to "put on Christ." The subsequent change of heart and practice must be the effect of his power, is a part of his purchase, and ought to be received as his gracious gift. And I will venture to foretell, that you will make the greater progress in true holiness, the less you are disposed to boast of, or to trust in it.

This, I apprehend, is the gospel itself, styled in Scripture, with the highest propriety, the "gospel of the grace of God." Christ came "not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." If you will rely on him for salvation, he will shed abroad the love of God in your hearts by the Holy Ghost, which will be a powerful and operative principle of new obedience. I beseech you therefore, in the most earnest manner, not to reject the counsel of God against yourselves. Nothing can be more liberal, or more gracious, than the offer of the gospel: "I will give to him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely." There is no sin of so deep a dye, or so infectious a stain, but the blood of Christ is sufficient to wash it out. There is not any slave of Satan so loaded with chains, but he is able to set him free. If you perish, it is of yourselves. I have given you warning, from a sincere and ardent concern for your everlasting interest; and may God himself, for Christ's sake, by his Holy Spirit, effectually persuade you to comply with it!

THE END.

EDINBURGH:
Printed by ANDREW SHORTREDE, Thistle Lane.

THE

CROOK IN THE LOT:

OR,

THE SOVEREIGNTY AND WISDOM OF GOD

IN

THE AFFLICTIONS OF MEN.

BY THE LATE

REV. THOMAS BOSTON,

MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL AT ETTRICK.

MEMOIR.

Thomas Boston was born on the 7th of March, 1676, at Dunse, in Berwickshire, where he received the rudiments of his education. His father being a nonconformist was imprisoned for his recusancy, and for the sake of company he retained his son in the prison along with him. At an early age, Boston was brought, through the ministrations of the celebrated preacher, Henry Erskine, to think seriously about the state of his soul; and while at school, he, with two other boys, had regular meetings in a chamber of his father's house, for reading the Scriptures and religious conference. On leaving the grammar school, where he had made remarkable progress, his father being scarcely able to defray the expense of his farther education, attempted to procure for him a gratuitous course at the University. This attempt was unsuccessful, and his father, determined, at all hazards, to carry him through the classes, entered him, in December, 1691, as a student of Greek at the University of Edinburgh, where he studied for three successive seasons. In the summer of 1694 he had the bursary of the presbytery of Dunse conferred on him as a student of theology, and, in January following, entered the theological class in the University, then taught by Mr George Campbell. On his return from College, after various unsuccessful attempts to settle himself in a school, he became tutor in a private family in Edinburgh. In 1697 he returned to Dunse, and was licensed as a preacher. After having been proposed first for the parish of Foulden, and next for the parishes of Abbey, of Carnock, of Clackmannan, and of Dollar, and being unsuccessful, he was ordained minister of the parish of Simprin in September, 1699. Eight years afterwards, he was, by synodical authority, transported to Ettrick, which being a scattered and extensive parish required much pastoral exertion. In 1702 he took the oath of allegiance to Queen Anne, and was a member of the first General Assembly held under that Queen in the month of March of the succeeding year, which was suddenly dissolved by the Earl of Seafield, the Commissioner, in the midst of a discussion upon an overture for preventing the marriage of Protestants with Papists. He was again a member of the General Assembly in 1708, when application was made, by persons liable to have the abjuration oath imposed upon them, for an act declaring the judgment of the Assembly regarding it. With this matter the Assembly would nowise interfere, which was regretted by Mr Boston, and he states it as a just retribution which "brought it to ministers' own doors" in 1712, only four years afterwards. Boston could not bring his mind to take the oath, and that he might elude the penalty of five hundred pounds sterling that was attached to the neglect or refusal to take it within a prescribed period, he made over to his eldest son a house in Dunse, which he had inherited from his father, and assigned all his other goods to his servant, John Currie. It does not, however, appear that he was ever brought to any real trouble on this account.

Amid all Mr Boston's attention to public affairs, he was still a most diligent minister. The notes of several sermons on the state of man, which he had preached, formed the foundation of his "Fourfold State," a work, the publication of which was delayed from the year 1714 till 1720, in consequence of the troubled state of the times. Under the title of "The Everlasting Espousals," a sermon of his was printed in 1714, which met with a very good reception, and paved the way for the publication of the "Fourfold State," the first edition of which came out in 1720. In 1719, the Assembly commenced a prosecution against Mr James Hog of Carnock, who had published an edition of the "Marrow of Modern Divinity," and against other ministers who had advocated its principles, which ended in an act forbidding all under their inspection in time coming to teach or preach any such doctrines. Considerable argument and discussion before the Assembly, regarding the injustice of this act, took place, and in these Boston made no despicable figure. In defiance of the act, too, he published, in 1726, an edition of the "Marrow," illustrated with copious notes. The Assembly ultimately remodelled the act complained of.

Following out his plan of illustrating gospel truth, Boston preached to his people a course of sermons on the Covenants of Works and of Grace, which have long been in the hands of the public. His last appearance in the General Assembly was in 1729; his last public work was a letter to the presbytery, which met at Selkirk, May 2, 1732, respecting the overture for settling vacant parishes. His health had been for a number of years declining, and on the 20th of the same month of the same year he died in the fifty-sixth year of his age. Mr Boston was married shortly after his settlement at Simprin, to Katherine Brown, by whom he had ten children, four of whom only survived him. The youngest, Thomas, was the founder of the Relief Church. In private life, Mr Boston was, like many of the fathers of the Scottish Church, as well as their descendants of the present day, a man of the most simple and unassuming habits and amiable disposition, and his memory is much cherished in the parish of Ettrick. He was particularly fond of music, and the sound of his violin, on which he is said to have been a proficient, used occasionally to give offence to some of the very rigid Presbyterians of the time.

"Of the character of Boston," says a recent biographer, "there can be but one opinion. Ardent and pious, his whole life was devoted to the promoting the glory of God, and the best interests of his fellow men. As an author, though he has been lowered by the publication of too many posthumous works, he must yet be admitted to stand in the first class. Even the most incorrect of his pieces betray the marks of a highly original and powerful mind."

THE CROOK IN THE LOT.

Consider the work of God: for who can make that straight which he hath made crooked?—Eccl. vii. 13.

A just view of afflicting incidents is altogether necessary to a Christian deportment under them: and that view is to be obtained only by faith, not by sense. For it is the light of the word alone that represents them justly, discovering in them the work of God, and consequently designs becoming the divine perfections. These perceived by the eye of faith, and duly considered, afford a just view of afflicting incidents fitted to quell the turbulent motions of corrupt affections under dismal outward appearances.

It is under this view that Solomon, in the preceding part of this chapter, advances several paradoxes, which are surprising determinations in favour of certain things, that to the eye of sense, looking gloomy and hideous, are therefore generally reputed grievous and shocking. He pronounceth "the day of one's death to be better than the day of his birth;" namely, the day of the death of one who, having become the friend of God through faith, hath lived to the honour of God, and the service of his generation, and thereby raised to himself a good and savoury "name, better than precious ointment." In like manner, he pronounceth "the house of mourning" to be preferable to the "house of feasting," sorrow to laughter, and "a wise man's rebuke to a fool's song;" for that, howbeit the latter are indeed the more pleasant, yet the former are the more profitable. And observing with concern how men are in hazard, not only from the world's frowns and ill usage, "oppression making a wise man mad," but also from its smiles and caresses, "a gift destroyeth the heart;" therefore, since whatever way it goes there is danger, he pronounceth the "end of every" worldly "thing better than the beginning thereof." And from the whole, he justly infers, that it is better to be humble and patient, than proud and impatient, under afflicting dispensations; since, in the former case, we wisely submit to what is really best; in the latter we fight against it. And he warns us against being angry with our lot, because of the adversity found therein; cautions against making odious comparisons of former and present times, in that point insinuating undue reflections on the providence of God; and prescribes, first, a general remedy against that querulous and fretful disposition, namely, holy wisdom, as that which makes the best of every thing, and even giveth life in killing circumstances; and then a particular remedy, consisting in a due application of that wisdom, towards forming a just view of the case, "Consider the work of God: For who can make that straight which he hath made crooked?"

In which words is proposed, 1. The remedy itself; 2. The suitableness thereof.

First, The *remedy* itself, is a wise eyeing of the hand of God in all we find to bear hard upon us: "Consider the work," or, "see thou the doing of God," namely, in the crooked, rough, and disagreeable parts of thy lot, the crosses thou findest in it. Thou seest very well the cross itself; yea, thou turnest it over and over in thy mind, and leisurely viewest it on all sides; thou lookest, withal, to this and the other second cause of it, and so thou art in a foam and a fret: but, wouldst thou be quieted and satisfied in the matter, lift up thine eyes towards heaven, see the doing of God in it, the operation of his hand: look at that, and consider it well; eye the first cause of the crook in thy lot; behold how it is the work of God, his doing.

Secondly, As for the *suitableness* of this remedy, that view of the crook in our lot is very suitable to still indecent risings of heart, and quiet us under it; "For who can," that is, none can, "make that straight which God hath made crooked?" As to the crook in thy lot, God hath made it; and it must continue while he will have it so. Shouldst thou apply thine utmost force to make it straight, thine attempt will be vain; it will not alter for all thou canst do; only he who made it can mend it, or make it straight. This consideration, this view of the matter, is a proper means at once to silence and to satisfy men, and so to bring them unto a dutiful submission to their Maker and Governor, under the crook in their lot.

Now, we take up the purpose of the text in these three doctrines.

Doct. I. Whatsoever crook there is in one's lot, it is of God's making.

Doct. II. What God sees meet to mar, one will not be able to mend in his lot.

Doct. III. The considering of the crook in the lot, as the work of God, or of his making, is a proper means to bring one to a Christian deportment under it.

Doct. I. Whatsoever crook there is in one's lot, it is of God's making.

Here, two things are to be considered, namely, the crook itself, and God's making of it.

I. As to the crook itself, the crook in the lot, for the better understanding thereof, these few things that follow are premised.

1. There is a certain train or course of events, by the providence of God, falling to every one of us during our life in this world: and that is our lot, as being allotted to us by the sovereign God, our Creator and Governor, "in whose hand our breath is, and whose are all our ways." This train of events is widely different to different persons, according to the will and pleasure of the sovereign manager, who ordereth men's conditions in the world in a great variety, some moving in a higher, some in a lower sphere.

2. In that train or course of events, some fall out cross to us, and against the grain; and these make the crook in our lot. While we are here, there will be cross events, as well as agreeable ones, in our lot and condition. Sometimes things are softly and agreeably gliding on; but, by and by, there is some incident which alters that course, grates us, and pains us,—as when we have made a wrong step, we begin to halt.

3. Every body's lot in this world hath some crook in it. Complainers are apt to make odious comparisons: they look about, and taking a distant wiew of the condition of others, can discern nothing in it but what is straight, and just to one's wish; so they pronounce their neighbour's lot wholly straight. But that is a false verdict; there is no perfection here; no lot out of heaven without a crook. For, as to "all the works that are done under the sun, behold all is vanity and vexation of spirit." "That which is crooked cannot be made straight." Who would have thought but Haman's lot was very straight, while his family was in a flourishing condition, and he prospering in riches and honour, being prime minister of state in the Persian court, and standing high in the king's favour? Yet there was, at the same time, a crook in his lot, which so galled him, that "all this availed him nothing," Esth. v. 13. Every one feels for himself, where he is pinched, though others perceive it not. Nobody's lot, in this world, is wholly crooked; there are always some straight and even parts in it. Indeed, when men's passions, having got up, have cast a mist over their minds, they are ready to say, all is wrong with them, nothing right; but, though in hell that tale is, and ever will be, true, yet it is never true in this world;—for there, indeed, there is not a drop of comfort allowed, Luke, xvi. 25; but here it always holds good, that "it is of the Lord's mercies we are not consumed," Lam. iii. 22.

4. The crook in the lot came into the world by sin; it is owing to the fall, Rom. v. 12. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;" under which death, the crook in the lot is comprehended, as a state of comfort or prosperity is, in Scripture style, exprest by living, 1 Sam. xxv. 6; John, iv. 50, 51. Sin so bowed the hearts and minds of men, that they became crooked in respect of the holy law; and God justly so bowed their lot, that it became crooked too. And this crook in our lot inseparably follows our sinful condition, till dropping this body of sin and death, we arrive within the gates of heaven.

These being premised, a crook in the lot speaks, in general, two things, (1.) *Adversity*, (2.) *Continuance.* Accordingly it makes a day of adversity, opposed to the day of prosperity, in the verse immediately following the text.

The crook in the lot is, *First*, Some one or other piece of adversity. The prosperous part of one's lot, which goes forward according to one's wish, is the straight and even part of it; the adverse part, going a contrary way, is the crooked part thereof. God hath intermixed these two in men's condition in this world; that, as there is some prosperity therein, making the straight line, so there is also some adversity, making the crooked. The which mixture hath place, not only in the lot of saints, who are told, that "in the world they shall have tribulation," but even in the lot of all, as already observed. *Secondly*, It is adversity of some continuance. We do not reckon it a crooked thing, which, though forcibly bended and bowed together, yet presently recovers its former straightness. These are twinges of the rod of adversity, which passing like a stitch in one's side, all is immediately set to rights again: one's lot may be suddenly overclouded, and the cloud vanish ere he is aware. But under the crook, one having leisure to find his smart, is in some concern to get the crook evened. So the crook in the lot is adversity, continued for shorter or longer time.

Now, there is a threefold crook in the lot incident to the children of men.

1. One made by a cross dispensation hath lasting effects. Such a crook did Herod's cruelty make in the lot of the mothers in

Bethlehem, who by the murderers were left "weeping for their slain children, and would not be comforted, because they were not," Matt. ii. 18. A slip of the foot may soon be made, which will make a man go halting all his days. "As the fishes are taken in an evil net, so are the sons of men snared in an evil time," Eccles. ix. 12. The thing may fall out in a moment, under which the party shall go halting to the grave.

2. There is a crook made by a train of cross dispensations, whether of the same or different kinds, following hard one upon another, and leaving lasting effects behind them. Thus in the case of Job, while one messenger of evil tidings "was yet speaking, another came," Job, i. 16—18. Cross events coming one upon the neck of another, deep calling unto the deep, make a sore crook. In that case, the party is like unto one, who, recovering his sliding foot from one infirm piece of ground, sets it on another equally infirm, which immediately gives way under him too; or, like unto one, who, travelling in an unknown mountainous tract, after having, with difficulty, made his way over one mountain, is expecting to see the plain country; but instead thereof, there comes in view, time after time, a new mountain to be passed. This crook in Asaph's lot had like to have made him give up all his religion, until he went into the sanctuary, where this mystery of Providence was unriddled to him, Psalm lxxiii. 13—17. Solomon observes, "That there be just men, unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked," Eccl. viii. 14. Providence taking a run against them, as if they were to be run down for good and all. Whoever they be, whose life in no part thereof affords them experience of this, sure Joseph missed not of it in his young days, nor Jacob in his middle days, nor Peter in his old days, nor our Saviour all his days.

3. There is a crook made by one cross dispensation, with lasting effects thereof coming in the room of another removed. Thus one crook straightened, there is another made in its place; and so there is still a crook. Want of children had long been the crook in Rachel's lot. That was at length evened to her mind; but then she got another in its stead,—hard labour in travailing to bring forth, Gen. xxx. 1; xxxv. 16. This world is a wilderness, in which we may indeed get our station changed; but the remove will be out of one wilderness station to another. When one part of the lot is evened, some other part thereof will speedily become crooked.

More particularly, the crook in the lot hath in it four things of the nature of that which is crooked.

(1.) *Disagreeableness.* A crooked thing is wayward: and, being laid to a rule, answers it not, but declines from it. There is not, in any body's lot, any such thing as a crook, in respect of the will and purposes of God. Take the most harsh and dismal dispensation in one's lot, and lay it to the eternal decree, made in the depth of infinite wisdom, before the world began, and it will answer it exactly, without the least deviation, "all things being wrought after the counsel of his will," Eph. i. 11. Lay it to the providential will of God, in the government of the world, and there is perfect harmony. If Paul is to be bound at Jerusalem, and "delivered into the hands of the Gentiles," it is "the will of the Lord" it should be so, Acts, xxi. 11—14. Wherefore the greatest crook of the lot, on earth, is straight in heaven; there is no disagreeableness in it there. But in every person's lot there is a crook in respect of their mind and natural inclination. The adverse dispensation lies cross to that rule, and will by no means answer it, nor harmonize with it. When Divine Providence lays the one to the other, there is a manifest disagreeableness: the man's will goes one way, and the dispensation another way; the will bends upwards, and cross events press down: so they are contrary. And there, and only there lies the crook. It is this disagreeableness which makes the crook in the lot fit matter of trial and exercise to us, in this our state of probation: in the which, if thou wouldst approve thyself to God, walking by faith, not by sight, thou must quiet thyself in the will and purpose of God, and not insist that it should be "according to thy mind." Job, xxxiv. 33.

(2.) *Unsightliness.* Crooked things are unpleasant to the eye; and no crook in the lot seemeth to be joyous, but grievous, making up an unsightly appearance, Heb. xii. 11. Therefore men need to beware of giving way to their thoughts, in dwelling on the crook in their lot, and keeping it too much in view. David shews a hurtful experience of his, in that kind, Psalm xxxix. 3. "While I was musing the fire burned." Jacob acted a wiser part, called his youngest son Benjamin, the son of the right hand, whom the dying mother had named Benoni, the son of my sorrow: by this means providing, that the crook in his lot should not be set afresh in his view, on every occasion of mentioning the name of his son. Indeed, a Christian may safely take a steady and leisurely view of the crook of his lot in the light of the holy word, which represents it as the discipline of the covenant. So faith will discover a hidden sightliness in it, under a very unsightly outward appearance; perceiving the suitableness thereof to the infinite goodness, love, and wisdom of God, and to the real and most valuable interests of the party: by which means one comes to take pleasure, and that a most refined pleasure, in distress, 2 Cor. xii. 10. But whatever the crook in the lot be to the eye of faith, it is not at all pleasant to the eye of sense.

(3.) *Unfitness for motion.* Solomon observes the cause of the uneasy and ungraceful walking of the lame, Prov. xxvi. 7. "The legs of the lame are not equal." This uneasiness they find, who are exercised about the crook in their lot: a high spirit and a low adverse lot, makes great difficulty in the Christian walk. There is nothing that gives temptation more easy access than the crook in the lot; nothing more apt to lead us out of the way. "Therefore," says the apostle, Heb. xii. 13, "make straight paths for your feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way." They are to be pitied, then, who are labouring under it, and not to be rigidly censured; though they are rare persons who learn this lesson, till taught by their own experience. It is long since Job made an observation in this case, which holds good unto this day, Job, xii. 5, "He that is ready to slip with his feet, is as a lamp despised in the thought of him that is at ease."

(4.) "Aptness to catch hold and entangle, like hooks, fish-hooks," Amos, iv. 2. The crook in the lot doth so very readily make impression, to the ruffling and fretting one's spirit, irritating corruption, that Satan fails not to make diligent use of it to these dangerous purposes; the which point once gained by the tempter, the tempted, ere he is aware, finds himself entangled as in a thicket, out of which he knows not how to extricate himself. In that temptation it often proves like a crooked stick troubling a standing pool, the which not only raiseth up the mud all over, but brings up from the bottom some very ugly thing. Thus it brought up a spice of blasphemy and atheism in Asaph's case, Psal. lxxiii. 13, "Verily I have cleansed my heart in vain, and washed my hands in innocence:" as if he had said, "There is nothing at all in religion, it is a vain and empty thing, that profiteth nothing; I was a fool to have been in care about purity and holiness, whether of heart or life." Ah! is this the pious Asaph? how is he turned so quite unlike himself! But the crook in the lot is the handle, whereby the tempter makes surprising discoveries of latent corruption even in the best.

This is the nature of the crook in the lot; let us now observe what part of the lot it falls in. Three conclusions may be established upon this head.

1*st*, It may fall in any part of the lot; there is no exempted one in the case; for, sin being found in every part, the crook may take place in any part. Being "all as an unclean thing, we may all fade as a leaf," Isa. lxiv. 6. The main stream of sin, which the crook readily follows, runs in very different channels, in the case of different persons. And in regard of the various dispositions of the minds of men, that will prove a sinking weight unto one, which another will go very lightly under.

2*dly*, It may at once fall in many parts of the lot, the Lord calling, as in a solemn day, one's terrors round about, Lam. ii. 22. Sometimes God makes one notable crook in a man's lot; but its name may be Gad, being but the forerunner of a troop which cometh. Then the crooks are multiplied, so that the party is made to halt on each side. While one stream, let in from one quarter, is running full against him, another is let in on him from another quarter, till in the end the waters break in on every hand.

3*dly*, It often falls in the tender part,—I mean, that part of the lot wherein we are least able to bear it, or at least think so, Psal. lv. 12, 13, "It was not an enemy that reproached me, then I could have borne it. But it was thou, a man mine equal, my guide, and mine acquaintance." If there is any one part of the lot in which, of all others, a person is disposed to nestle, the thorn will readily be laid there, especially if he belongs to God; in that thing wherein he is least of all able to be touched, he will be sure to be pressed. There the trial will be taken of him; for there is the grand competition with Christ. "I take from them the desires of their eyes, and that whereupon they set their minds," Ezek. xxiv. 25. Since the crook in the lot is the special trial appointed for every one, it is altogether reasonable, and becoming the wisdom of God, that it fall on that which of all things doth most rival him.

But more particularly, the crook may be observed to fall in these four parts of the lot.

First, In the *natural* part, affecting persons considered as of the make allotted for them by the great God that formed all things. The parents of mankind, Adam and Eve, were formed altogether sound and entire, without the least blemish, whether in soul or body; but in the formation of their posterity, there often appears a notable variation from the original. Bodily defects, superfluities, deformities, infirmities, natural or accidental, make the crook in the lot of some: they have something unsightly or grievous about them. Crooks of this kind, more or less observable, are very common and ordinary, the best not exempted from them; and it is purely owing to sovereign pleasure they are not more numerous. Tender eyes made the crook in the lot of Leah; Rachel's beauty was balanced with barrenness; Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, was, it would seem, no personable man, but of a mean outward appearance, for which fools were apt to contemn him, 2 Cor. x. 10. Timothy was of a crazy frame, weakly and sickly, 1 Tim. v. 23. And there is a yet far more considerable crook in the lot of the lame, the blind, the deaf, and the dumb.

Some are weak to a degree in their intellectuals; and it is the crook in the lot of several bright souls to be overcast with clouds, notably bemisted and darkened, from the crazy bodies they are lodged in; an eminent instance whereof we have in the grave, wise, and patient Job, "going mourning without the sun; yea, standing up and crying in the congregation," Job, xxx. 28.

Secondly, It may fall in the *honorary* part. There is honour due to all men, the small as well as the great, 1 Peter, ii. 17, and that upon the ground of the original constitution of human nature, as it was framed in the image of God. But, in the sovereign disposal of holy Providence, the crook in the lot of some falls here; they are neglected and slighted; their credit is still kept low; they go through the world under a cloud, being put into an ill name, their reputation sunk. This sometimes is the native consequence of their own foolish and sinful conduct; as in the case of Dinah, who, by her gadding abroad to satisfy her youthful curiosity, regardless of, and therefore not waiting for, a providential call, brought a lasting stain on her honour, Gen. xxxiv. But, where the Lord intends a crook of this kind in one's lot, innocence will not be able to ward it off in an ill-natured world; neither will true merit be able to make head against it, to make one's lot stand straight in that part. Thus David represents his case, Psal. xxxi. 11—13, "They that did see me without, fled from me: I am forgotten as a dead man out of mind; I am like a broken vessel. For I have heard the slander of many."

Thirdly, It may fall in the *vocational* part. Whatever is man's calling or station in the world, be it sacred or civil, the crook in their lot may take its place therein. Isaiah was an eminent prophet, but most unsuccessful, Isa. liii. 1. Jeremiah met with such a train of discouragements and ill usage in the exercise of his sacred function, that he was well-nigh giving it up, saying, "I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name," Jer. xx. 9. The Psalmist observes this crook often to be made in the lot of some men very industrious in their civil business, who sow the fields, and at times God blesseth them, "and suffereth not their cattle to decrease:" but again they are minished and brought low through oppression, affliction, and sorrow, Psal. cvii. 37—39. Such a crook was made in Job's lot after he had long stood even. Some manage their employments with all care and diligence; the husbandman carefully labouring his ground; the sheep-master diligent to know the state "of his flocks, and looking well to his herds;" the tradesman, early and late at his business; the merchant diligently plying his, watching and falling in with the most fair and promising opportunities; but there is such a crook in that part of their lot, as all they are able to do can by no means even. For why? The most proper means used for compassing an end are insignificant without a word of divine appointment commanding their success. "Who is he that saith, and it cometh to pass, when the Lord commandeth it not?" Lam. iii. 37. People ply their business with skill and industry, but the wind turns in their face. Providence crosseth their enterprizes, disconcerts their measures, frustrates their hopes and expectations, renders their endeavours unsuccessful, and so puts and keeps them still in straitening circumstances. "So the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise," Eccl. ix. 12. Providence interposing, crooks the measures which human prudence and industry had laid straight towards the respective ends; so the swift lose the race, and the strong the battle, and the wise miss of bread; while, in the mean time, some one or other providential incident, supplying the defect of human wisdom, conduct, and ability, the slow gain the race, and carry the prize; the weak win the battle, and enrich themselves with the spoil; and the bread falls into the lap of the fool.

Lastly, It may fall on the *relational* part. Relations are the joints of society; and there the crook in the lot may take place, one's smartest pain being often felt in these joints. They are in their nature the springs of man's comfort; yet they often run the greatest bitterness to him. Sometimes this crook is occasioned by the loss of relations. Thus a crook was made in the lot of Jacob by means of the death of Rachel, his beloved wife, and the loss of Joseph, his son and darling, which had like to have made him go halting to the grave. Job laments this crook in his lot, chap. xvi. 7, "Thou hast made desolate all my company;" meaning his dear children, every one of whom he had laid in the grave, not so much as one son or daughter left him. Again, sometimes it is made through the afflicting hand of God lying heavy on them: the which, in virtue of the relation, recoils on the party, as is feelingly expressed by that believing woman, Matt. xv. 22, "Have mercy on me, O Lord; my daughter is grievously vexed." Ephraim felt the smart of a course of afflictions "when he called his son's name Beriah, because it went evil with his house," 1 Chron. vii. 23. Since all is not only vanity but vexation of spirit, it can hardly miss, but the more of these springs of comfort are opened to a man, he must, at one time or other, find he has but the more sources of sorrow to gush out and spring in upon him; the sorrow always proportioned to the comfort found in them, or expected from them. And, finally, the crook is sometimes made by their proving uncomfortable, through the disagreeableness of their temper, disposition, and way. There was a crook in Job's lot, by means of an undutiful, ill-natured wife, Job, xix. 17. In Abigail's, by means of a surly, ill-tempered husband, 1 Sam. xxv. 25. In Eli's, through the perverseness and obstinacy of his children, chap. ii. 25. In Jonathan's, through the furious temper of his father, chap. xx. 30—33. So do men oftentimes find their greatest cross where they expected their greatest comfort. Sin hath unhinged the whole creation, and made every relation susceptible of the crook. In the family are found masters hard and unjust, servants froward and unfaithful; in a neighbourhood, men selfish and uneasy; in the church, ministers unedifying, and offensive in their walk, and people contemptuous and disorderly, a burden to the spirit of ministers; in the state, magistrates oppressive, and discountenancers of that which is good, and subjects turbulent and seditious; all these cause crooks in the lot of their relatives. And thus far of the crook itself.

II. Having seen the crook itself, we are, in the next place, to consider God's *making* it. And here is to be shewn, 1. That it is of God's making. 2. How it is of his making. 3. Why he makes it.

First, That the crook in the lot, whatever it is, is of God's *making*, appears from these three considerations.

First, It cannot be questioned, but the crook in the lot, considered as a crook, is a penal evil, whatever it is for the matter thereof; that is, whether the thing in itself, its immediate cause and occasion, be sinful or not, it is certainly a punishment or affliction. Now, as it may be, as such, holily and justly brought on us by our Sovereign Lord and Judge, so he expressly claims the doing or making of it, Amos, iii. 6. " Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord has not done it?" Wherefore, since there can be no penal evil, but of God's making, and the crook in the lot is such an evil, it is necessarily concluded to be of God's making.

Secondly, It is evident, from the scripture doctrine of divine providence, that God brings about every man's lot, and all the parts thereof. He sits at the helm of human affairs, and turns them about whithersoever he listeth. " Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did he in heaven and earth, in the seas, and all deep places," Psal. cxxxv. 6. There is not any thing whatsoever befalls us, without his overruling hand. The same providence that brought us out of the womb, bringeth us to, and fixeth us in, the condition and place allotted for us by him who " hath determined the times and bounds of our habitation," Acts, xvii. 26. It overrules the smallest and most casual things about us, even the hairs of our head, Matt. x. 29, 30. " The lot cast into the lap," Prov. xvi. 33. Yea, the free acts of our will, whereby we choose for ourselves, for even " the king's heart is in the hand of the Lord as the rivers of water," Prov. xxi. 1. And the whole steps we make, and which others make in reference to us; for " the way of man is not in himself, it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps," Jer. x. 23. And this, whether these steps causing the crook be deliberate and sinful ones, such as Joseph's brethren selling him into Egypt; or whether they be undesigned, such as man-slaughter purely casual, as when one hewing wood kills his neighbour with " the head of the axe slipping from the helve," Deut. xix. 5. For there is a holy and wise Providence that governs the sinful and the heedless actions of men, as a rider doth a lame horse, of whose halting, not he, but the horse's lameness, is the true and proper cause; wherefore, in the former of these cases, God is said to have sent Joseph into Egypt, Gen. xlv. 7, and in the latter, to deliver one into his neighbour's hand, Exod. xxi. 13.

Lastly, God hath, by an eternal decree, immoveable as mountains of brass, Zech. vi. 1, appointed the whole of every one's lot, the crooked parts thereof, as well as the straight. By the same eternal decree, whereby the high and low parts of the earth, the mountains and the valleys, were appointed, are the heights and depths, the prosperity and adversity, in the lot of the inhabitants thereof, determined; and they are brought about, in time, in a perfect agreeableness thereto.

The mystery of Providence, in the government of the world, is, in all the parts thereof, the building reared up of God, in exact conformity to the plan in his decree, " who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will," Eph. i. 11. So that there is never a crook in one's lot, but may be run up to this original. Hereof Job piously sets us an example in his own case, Job, xxiii. 13, 14. "He is in one mind, and who can turn him? And what his soul desireth, even that he doth. For he performeth the thing that is appointed for me; and many such things are with him."

Secondly, That we may see *how* the crook in the lot is of God's making, we must distinguish between pure sinless crooks, and impure sinful ones.

First, There are pure and sinless crooks—the which are mere afflictions, cleanly crosses, grievous indeed, but not defiling. Such were Lazarus's poverty, Rachel's barrenness, Leah's tender eyes, the blindness of the man who had been so from his birth, John, ix. 1. Now, the crooks of this kind are of God's making, by the efficacy of his power directly bringing them to pass, and causing them to be. He is the maker of the poor, Prov. xvii. 5. " Whoso mocketh the poor, reproacheth his Maker;" that is, reproacheth God, who made him poor, according to that, 1 Sam. ii. 7, "The Lord maketh poor." It is he that hath the key of the womb, and, as he sees meet, shuts it, 1 Sam. i. 5, or opens it, Gen. xxix. 31; and it is "he that formeth the eyes," Psalm xciv. 9; and the man was "born blind, that the works of God should be made manifest in him," John, ix. 3; therefore he saith to Moses, Exod. iv. 11, "Who maketh the dumb, or deaf, or the seeing, or the blind? Have not I, the Lord?" Such crooks in the lot are of God's making, in the most ample sense, and in their full comprehension, being the direct effects of his agency, as well as the heavens and the earth are.

Secondly, There are impure sinful crooks, which, in their own nature, are sins as well as afflictions, defiling as well as grievous. Such was the crook made in David's lot, through his family disorders, the defiling of Tamar, the murder of Amnon, the rebellion of Absalom—all of them unnatural. Of the same kind was that made in Job's lot by the Sabeans and Chaldeans, taking away his substance, and slaying his servants. As these were the afflictions of David and Job respectively, so they were the sins of the actors, the unhappy instruments thereof. Thus one and the same thing may be to one a heinous sin, defiling and laying him under guilt, and to another an affliction, laying him under suffering only. Now, the crooks of this kind are not of God's making, in the same latitude as those of the former; for he neither puts evil in the heart of any, nor stirreth up to it. "He cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man," James, i. 13. But they are of his making, by his holy permission of them, powerful bounding of them, and wise overruling of them to some good end.

1st, He holily permits them, suffering men "to walk in their own ways," Acts, xiv. 16. Though he is not the author of these sinful crooks, causing them to be by the efficacy of his power; yet if he did not permit them, willing not to hinder them, they could not be at all: for "he shutteth, and no man openeth," Rev. iii. 7. But he justly withholds his grace which the sinner doth not desire, takes off the restraint under which he is uneasy, and since the sinner will be gone, lays the reins on his neck, and leaves him to the swing of his lust. Hos. iv. 17, "Ephraim is joined to idols; let him alone." Psalm lxxxi. 11, 12, "Israel would none of me; so I gave them up to their own hearts' lust." In which unhappy situation the sinful crook doth, from the sinner's own proper motion, natively and infallibly follow; even as water runs down a hill, wherever there is a gap left open before it. So in these circumstances, "Israel walked in their own counsels;" and thus this kind of crook is of God's making, as a just judge punishing the sufferer by it. The which view of the matter silenced David under Shimei's cursings, 2 Sam. xvi. 10, "Let him alone, and let him curse, for the Lord hath bidden him."

2dly, He powerfully bounds them, Psalm lxxvi. 10, "The remainder of wrath (namely, the creature's wrath) thou shalt restrain." Did not God bound these crooks, howsoever sore they are in any one's case, they would be yet sorer; but he says to the sinful instrument as he said to the sea, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no farther; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." He lays a restraining bond on him, that he cannot go one step farther, in the way his impetuous lust drives, than he sees meet to permit. Hence it comes to pass, that the crook of this kind is neither more nor less, but just as great as he by his powerful bounding makes it to be. An eminent instance hereof we have in the case of Job, whose lot was crooked through a peculiar agency of the devil; but even to that grand sinner, God set a bound in the case: "The Lord said unto Satan, Behold all that he hath is in thy power, only upon himself put not forth thine hand," Job, i. 12. Now, Satan went the full length of the bound, leaving nothing within the compass thereof untouched, which he saw could make for his purpose, ver. 18, 19. But he could by no means move one step beyond it, to carry his point, which he could not gain within it. And therefore, to make the trial greater, and the crook sorer, nothing remained but that the bound set should be removed, and the sphere of his agency enlarged; for which cause he saith, "But touch his bone and his flesh, and he will curse thee to thy face," chap. ii. 5, and it being removed accordingly, but withal a new one set, ver. 6, "Behold he is in thine hand, but save his life;" the crook was carried to the utmost that the new bound would permit, in a consistency with his design of bringing Job to blaspheme; "Satan smote him with sore boils, from the sole of his foot unto the crown of his head," ver. 7. And had it not been for this bound, securing Job's life, he, after finding this attempt successless too, had doubtless despatched him for good and all.

3dly, He wisely overrules them to some good purpose, becoming the divine perfections. While the sinful instrument hath an ill design in the crook caused by him, God directs to a holy and good end. In the disorders of David's family, Amnon's design was to gratify a brutish lust; Absalom's, to glut himself with revenge, and to satisfy his pride and ambition; but God meant thereby to punish David for his sin in the matter of Uriah. In the crook made in Job's lot, by Satan, and the Sabeans and Chaldeans, his instruments, Satan's design was to cause Job blaspheme, and theirs to gratify their covetousness: but God had another design therein becoming himself, namely, to manifest Job's sincerity, and uprightness. Did not he wisely and powerfully overrule these crooks made in men's lot, no good could come out of them; but he always overrules them so as to fulfil his own holy purposes thereby, howbeit the sinner meaneth not so; for his designs cannot miscarry, his "counsel shall stand," Isai. xlvi. 10. So the sinful crook is, by the overruling hand of God, turned about to his own glory, and his people's good in the end; according to the word, Prov. xvi. 4, "The Lord hath made all things for himself." Rom. viii. 28, "All things work together for good to them that love God." Thus Haman's plot for the destruction of the Jews "was turned to the contrary," Esth. ix. 1. And the crook made in Joseph's lot, by his own brethren selling him into Egypt, though it was on their part most sinful, and of a most mischievous design; yet, as it was of God's making, by his holy permission, powerful bounding, and wise overruling of it, had an issue well becoming the divine wisdom and goodness: both of which Joseph noticeth to them, Gen. l. 20, "As for you, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive."

Thirdly, It remains to inquire, Why God makes a crook in one's lot? And this is to be cleared by discovering the design of that dispensation; a matter which it concerns every one to know, and carefully to notice, in order to a Christian improvement of the crook in their lot. The design thereof seems to be, chiefly, sevenfold.

First, The trial of one's state, Whether one is in the state of grace or not? Whether a sincere Christian, or a hypocrite? Though every affliction is trying, yet here I conceive lies the main providential trial a man is brought upon with reference to his state; forasmuch as the crook in the lot, being a matter of a continued course, one has occasion to open and shew himself again and again in the same thing; whence it comes to pass, that it ministers ground for a decision, in that momentous point. It was plainly on this bottom that the trial of Job's state was put. The question was, whether Job was an upright and sincere servant of God, as God himself testified of him; or but a mercenary one, a hypocrite, as Satan alleged against him? And the trial hereof was put upon the crook to be made in his lot, Job, i. 8—12, and ii. 3—6. Accordingly, that which all his friends, save Elihu, the last speaker, did, in their reasoning with him under his trial, aim at, was to prove him a hypocrite; Satan thus making use of these good men for gaining his point. As God took trial of Israel in the wilderness, for the land of Canaan, by a train of afflicting dispensations, the which Caleb and Joshua bearing strenuously, were declared meet to enter the promised land, as having "followed the Lord fully;" while others being tired out with them, their carcasses fell in the wilderness; so he makes trial of men for heaven, by the crook in their lot. If one can stand that test, he is manifested to be a saint, a sincere servant of God, as Job was proved to be; if not, he is but a hypocrite: he cannot stand the test of the crook in his lot, but goes away like dross in God's furnace. A melancholy instance of which we have in that man of honour and wealth, who, with high pretences of religion, arising from a principle of moral seriousness, addressed himself to our Saviour, to know "what he should do that he might inherit eternal life," Mark, x. 17—21. Our Saviour, to discover the man to himself, makes a crook in his lot, where all along before it had stood even, obliging him, by a probatory command, to sell and give away all that he had, and follow him. "Sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and come take up the cross and follow me." Hereby he was that moment, in the court of conscience, stript of his great possessions; so that thenceforth he could no longer keep them, with a good conscience, as he might have done before. The man instantly felt the smart of this crook made in his lot; "he was sad at that saying," that is, immediately upon the hearing of it, being struck with pain, disorder, and confusion of mind, his countenance changed, became cloudy and lowering, as the same word is used, Matt. xvi. 3. He could not stand the test of that crook; he could by no means submit his lot to God in that point, but behoved to have it, at any rate, according to his own mind. So he "went away grieved, for he had great possessions." He went away from Christ back to his plentiful estate, and though with a pained and sorrowful heart, sat him down again on it a violent possessor before the Lord, thwarting the divine order. And there is no appearance that ever this order was revoked, nor that ever he came to a better temper in reference thereunto.

Secondly, Excitation to duty, weaning one from this world, and prompting him to look after the happiness of the other world. Many have been beholden to the crook in their lot that ever they came to themselves, settled, and turned serious. Going for a time "like a wild ass used to the wilderness," scorning to be turned, their foot hath slid in due time; and a crook being hereby made in their lot, their month hath come, wherein they have been caught, Jer. ii. 24. Thus was the prodigal brought to himself, and obliged to entertain thoughts of returning unto his father, Luke, xv. 17. The crook in their lot convinces them at length that here is not their rest. Finding still a prickling thorn of uneasiness, whensoever they lay down their head where they would fainest take rest in the creature, and that they are obliged to lift it again, they are brought to conclude, there is no hope from that quarter, and begin to cast about for rest another way; so it makes them errands to God, which they had not before, forasmuch as they feel a need of the comforts of the other world, to which their mouths were out of taste, while their lot stood even to their mind. Wherefore, whatever use we make of the crook in our lot, the voice of it is, "Arise ye, and depart, this is not your rest." And it is surely that which, of all means of mortification of the afflictive kind, doth most deaden a real Christian to this life and world.

Thirdly, Conviction of sin. As when one walking heedlessly is suddenly taken ill of a lameness, his going halting the rest of his way convinceth him of having made a wrong step, and every new painful step brings it afresh to his mind; so God makes a crook in one's lot, to convince him of some false step he hath made, or course he hath taken. What the sinner would otherwise be apt to overlook, forget, or think light of, is by this means recalled to mind, set before him as an evil and bitter thing, and kept in remembrance, that his heart may every now and then bleed for it afresh. Thus, by the crook, men's sin finds them out to their conviction, "as the thief is ashamed when he is found," Numb. xxxii. 23; Jer. ii. 29. The which Joseph's brethren do feelingly express, under the crook made in their lot in Egypt, Gen. xlii. 21, "We are verily guilty concerning our brother:" chap. xliv. 16, "God hath found out the iniquity of thy servants." The crook in the lot doth usually, in its nature or circumstances, so natively refer to the false step or course, that it serves for a providential memorial of it, bringing the sin, though of an old date, fresh to remembrance, and for a badge of the sinner's folly, in word or deed, to keep it ever before him. When Jacob found Leah, through Laban's unfair dealing, palmed upon him for Rachel, how could he miss of a stinging remembrance of the cheat he had, seven years at least before, put on his own father, pretending himself to be Esau? Gen. xxvii. 19. How could it miss of galling him occasionally afterwards during the course of the marriage? He had imposed on his father the youngest brother for the elder, and Laban imposed on him the elder sister for the younger. The dimness of Isaac's eyes favoured the former cheat; and the darkness of the evening did as much favour the latter. So he behoved to say, as Adoni-bezek in another case, Judges, i. 7,—"As I have done, so God hath requited me." In like manner, Rachel dying in childbirth, could hardly avoid a melancholy reflection on her rash and passionate expression, "Give me children, or else I die," Gen. xxx. 1. Even holy Job read, in the crook of his lot, some false steps he had made in his youth many years before, Job, xiii. 26, "Thou writest bitter things against me, and makest me to possess the iniquities of my youth."

Fourthly, Correction, or punishment for sin. In nothing more than in the crook of the lot, is that word verified, Jer. ii. 19, "Thine own wickedness shall correct thee, and thy backslidings shall reprove thee." God may for a time wink at one's sin, which afterwards he will brand with his indignation by crooking the sinner's lot, as he did in the case of Jacob, and of Rachel, mentioned before. Though the sin was a passing action, or a course of not long continuance, the mark of the divine displeasure for it, set on the sinner in the crook of his lot, may pain him long and sore, that by repeated experience he may know what an evil and bitter thing it was. David's killing Uriah by the sword of the Ammonites was soon over; but for that cause "the sword never departed from his house," 2 Sam. xii. 19. Gehazi quickly obtained two bags of money from Naaman, in the way of falsehood and lying; but as a lasting mark of the divine indignation against the profane trick, he got withal a leprosy which clave to him while he lived, and to his posterity after him, 1 Kings, v. 27. This may be the case, as well where the sin is pardoned, as to the guilt of eternal wrath, as where it is not. And one may have confessed and sincerely repented of that sin, which yet shall make him go halting to the grave, though it cannot carry him to hell. A man's person may be accepted in the Beloved, who yet had a particular badge of the divine displeasure, which his sin hung upon him in the crook of the lot, Psal. xcix. 8, "Thou wast a God that forgavest them, though thou tookest vengeance on their inventions."

Fifthly, Preventing of sin, Hos. ii. 6, "I will hedge up thy way with thorns, and make a wall, that she shall not find her paths." The crook in the lot will readily be found to lie cross to some wrong bias of the heart, which peculiarly sways with the party. So it is like a thorn hedge or wall in the way which that bias inclines him to. The defiling objects in the world, do specially take and prove ensnaring, as they are suited to the particular cast of temper in men; but by means of the crook in the lot, the paint and varnish is worn off the defiling object, whereby it loseth its former taking appearance. So the fuel being removed, the edge of corrupt affections is blunted, temptation weakened, and much sin prevented; the sinner, after "gadding about so much to change his way, returning ashamed," Jer. ii. 36, 37. Thus the Lord crooks one's lot, that "he may withdraw man from his purposes, and hide pride from men:" and so "he keepeth back his soul from the pit," Job, xxxiii. 17, 18. Every one knows what is most pleasant to him; but God alone knows what is the most profitable. As all men are liars, so all men are fools too. He is the "only wise God," Jude, 25. Many are obliged to the crook in their lot, that they go not to those excesses which their vain minds and corrupt affection would with full sail carry them to; and they would from their hearts bless God for making it, if they did but calmly consider what would most probably be the issue of the removal thereof. When one is in hazard of fretting under the hardship of bearing the crook, he would do well to consider what condition he is as yet in, for to bear its removal in a Christian manner.

Sixthly, Discovery of the latent corruption, whether in saints or sinners. There are some corruptions in every man's heart, which lie, as it were, so near the surface, that they are ready on every turn to cast up; but then there are others also which lie so very deep, that they are scarcely observed at all. But as the fire under the pot makes the scum to cast up, appear at top, and run over; so the crook in the lot raiseth up from the bottom, and brings out such corruption as otherwise one could hardly imagine to be within. Who would have suspected such strength of passion in the meek Moses as he discovered at the waters of strife, and for which he was kept out of Canaan? Psalm cvi. 32, 33; Numb. xx. 13—so much bitterness of spirit in the patient Job, as to charge God with becoming cruel to him? Job xxx. 21—so much ill nature in the good Jeremiah, as to curse not only the day of his birth, but even the man who brought tidings of it to his father? Jer. xx. 14, 15—or such a twang of atheism in Asaph, as to pronounce religion a vain thing? Psalm lxxiii. 13. But the crook in the lot, bringing out these things, shewed them to have been within, how long soever they had lurked unobserved. And as this design, however indecently proud scoffers allow themselves to treat it, is in no way inconsistent with the divine perfections; so the discovery itself is necessary for the due humiliation of sinners, and to stain the pride of all glory, that men may know themselves. Both which appear, in that it was on this very design that God made the long-continued crook in Israel's lot in the wilderness; even to humble them and prove them, to know what was in their heart, Deut. viii. 2.

Lastly, The exercise of grace in the children of God. Believers, through the remains of indwelling corruption, are liable to fits of spiritual laziness, and inactivity, in which their graces lie dormant for the time. Besides, there are some graces, which, of their own nature, are but occasional in their exercises; as being exercised only upon occasion of certain things, to which they have a necessary relation: such as patience and long-suffering. Now, the crook in the lot serves to rouse up a Christian to the exercise of the graces overpowered by corruption, and withal to call forth to action the occasional graces, ministering proper occasions for them. The truth is, the crook in the lot is the great engine of Providence for making men appear in their true colours, discovering both their ill and their good; and if the grace of God be in them, it will bring it out, and cause it to display itself. It so puts the Christian to his shifts, that however it makes him stagger for a while, yet it will at length evidence both the reality and the strength of grace in him. "Ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations, that the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, may be found unto praise," 1 Pet. i. 6, 7. The crook in the lot gives rise to many acts of faith, hope, love, self-denial, resignation, and other graces; to many heavenly breathings, pantings, longings, and groanings, which otherwise would not be brought forth. And I make no question but these things, howsoever by carnal men despised as trifling, are more precious in the sight of God than even believers themselves are aware of, being acts of immediate internal worship; and will, at length, have a surprising notice taken of them, and of the sum of them, howbeit the persons themselves often can hardly think them worth their own notice at all. We know who hath said to the gracious soul, "Let me see thy countenance; thy countenance is comely: thou hast ravished my heart with one of thine eyes," Song ii. 24; iv. 9. The steady acting of a gallant army of horse and foot to the routing of the enemy, is highly prized; but the acting of holy fear and humble hope, is in reality far more valuable, as being so in the sight of God, whose judgment, we are sure, is according to truth. This the Psalmist teacheth, Psalm cxlvii. 11, 12, "He delighteth not in the strength of the horse: he taketh not pleasure in the legs of a man. The Lord taketh pleasure in them that fear him, in those that hope in his mercy." And indeed the exercise of the graces of his Spirit in his people, is so very precious in his sight, that whatever grace any of them do excel in, they will readily get such a crook made in their lot, as will be a special trial for it, that will make a proof of its full strength. Abraham excelled in the grace of faith, in trusting God's bare word of promise over the feelings of sense: and God giving him a promise, that "he would make of him a great nation," made withal a crook in his lot, by which he had enough to do with all the strength of his faith; while he was obliged for good and all to leave his country and kindred, and sojourn among the Canaanites; his wife continuing barren, till past the age of child-bearing; and when she had at length brought forth Isaac, and he was grown up, he was called to offer him up for a burnt-offering, the more exquisite trial of his faith, in that Ishmael was now expelled his family, and that it was declared that "in Isaac" only "his seed should be called," Gen. xxi. 11. "Moses was very meek above all the men which were upon the face of the earth," Numb. xii. 3. And he was intrusted with the conduct of a most perverse and unmanageable people; the crook in his lot, plainly designed for the exercise of his meekness. Job excelled in patience, and by the crook in his lot, he got as much to do with it. For God gives none of his people to excel in a gift, but some one time or other he will afford them use for the whole compass of it.

Now, the *use* of this doctrine is threefold. (1.) For reproof. (2.) For consolation. And (3.) For exhortation.

Use 1. Of *reproof.* And it meets with three sorts of persons as reproveable.

First, The carnal and earthly, who do not with awe and reverence regard the crook in their lot as of God's making. There is certainly a signature of the Divine hand upon it to be perceived by just observers; and that challengeth an awful regard, the neglect of which forebodes destruction, Psalm xxviii. 5, "Because they regard not the works of the Lord, nor the operation of his hands, thou shalt destroy them, and not build them up." And herein they are deeply guilty, who, poring upon second causes, and looking no farther than the unhappy instruments of the crook in their lot, overlook the First Cause, as a dog snarls at the stone, but looks not to the hand that casts it. This is, in fact, to make a God of the creature; so regarding it, as if it could of itself effect any thing, while in the mean time, it is but an instrument in the hand of God, "the rod of his anger," Is. x. 5. "ordained of him for judgment, established for correction," Hab. i. 12. Oh, why should men terminate their view on the instruments of the crook in their lot, and so magnify their scourges! The truth is, they are, for the most part, rather to be pitied, as having an undesirable office, who, for the gratifying their sensuality, set themselves to despise the crook in their lot, and make nothing of it, and give up themselves to their own corrupt affections, in making crooks in the lot of others, which return on their own heads at length with a vengeance, as did "the blood of Jezreel on the house of Jehu," Hos. i. 4. And it is specially undesirable to be so employed in the case of such as belong to God; for rarely is the ground of the quarrel the same on the part of the instrument as on God's part, but very different; witness Shimei's cursing David, as a bloody man, meaning the blood of the house of Saul, which he was not guilty of, while God meant it of the blood of Uriah, which he could not deny, 2 Sam. xvi. 7, 8. Moreover, the quarrel will be at length taken up between God and his people; and then their scourges will find they had but a thankless office, Zech. i. 13, "I was but a little displeased, and they helped forward the affliction," saith God, in resentment of the heathen crooking the lot of his people. In like manner are they guilty, who impute the crook in their lot to fortune, or their ill-luck, which in very deed is nothing but a creature of the imagination, framed for a blind to keep men from acknowledging the hand of God: Thus, what the Philistines doubted, they do more impiously determine, saying, in effect, "It is not his hand that smote us, it was a chance that happened us," 1 Sam. vi. 8. And, finally, those also, who, in the way of giving up themselves to carnal mirth and sensuality, set themselves to despise the crook in their lot, to make nothing of it, and to forget it. I question not, but one commiting his case to the Lord, and looking to him for remedy in the first place, may lawfully call on the moderate use of the comforts of life for help in the second place. But as for that course so frequent and usual in this case among carnal men, if the crook of the lot really be, as indeed it is, of God's making, it must needs be a most indecent, unbecoming course, to be abhorred of all good men, Prov. iii. 11, "My son, despise not the chastening of the Lord." It is surely a very desperate method of cure, which cannot miss of issuing in something worse than the disease, however it may palliate it for a while, Isa. xxii. 12, 14, "In that day did the Lord God of Hosts call to weeping and to mourning, and behold joy and gladness, eating flesh and drinking wine: and it was revealed in mine ears, by the Lord of Hosts, surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die."

Secondly, The *unsubmissive,* whose hearts, like the troubled sea, swell and boil, fret and murmur, and cannot be at rest under the crook in their lot. This is a most sinful and dangerous course. The apostle Jude, characterizing some, "to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever," saith of them, ver. 16, "These are murmurers, complainers," namely, still complaining of their lot, which is the import of the word there used by the Holy Ghost. For since the crook in their lot, which their unsubdued spirits can by no means submit to, is of God's making, this their practice must needs be a fighting against God: and these their complainings and murmurings are indeed against him, whatever face they put upon them. Thus when the Israelites murmured against Moses, God charges them with murmuring against himself: "how long shall I bear with this evil congregation, which murmured against me?" Numb. xiv. 2—27. Ah! may not he who made and fashioned us without our advice, be allowed to make our lot too, without asking our mind, but we must rise up against him on account of the crook made in it? What doth this speak, but that the proud creature cannot endure God's work, nor digest what he hath done? And how black and dangerous is that temper of spirit! How is it possible to miss of being broken to pieces in such a course? "He is wise in heart, and mighty in strength. Who hath hardened himself against him, and hath prospered?" Job, ix. 4.

Lastly, The *careless* and *unfruitful,* who do not set themselves dutifully to comply with the design of the crook in their lot. God and nature do nothing in vain. Since he makes the crook, there is doubtless a becoming design in it, which we are obliged in duty to fall in with, according to that, Micah, vi. 9, "Hear ye the rod." And, indeed, if one shut not his own eyes, but be willing to understand, he may easily perceive the general design thereof to be to wean him from this world, and move him to seek and take up his heart's rest in God. And the nature and the circumstances of the crook itself being duly considered, it will not be very hard to make a more particular discovery of the design thereof. But, alas! the careless sinner, sunk in spiritual sloth and stupidity, is in no concern to discover the design of Providence in the crook; so he cannot fall in with it, but remains unfruitful; and all the pains taken on him, by the great husbandman, in the dispensation, are lost. They cry out by reason of "the arm of the mighty;" groaning under the pressure of the crook itself, and weight of the hand of the instrument thereof. "But none saith, Where is God my maker?" they look not, they turn not unto God for all that, Job, xxxv. 9, 10.

Use 2. Of *consolation.* It speaks comfort to the afflicted children of God. Whatever is the crook in your lot, it is of God's making; and therefore you may look upon it kindly. Since it is your Father has made it for you, question not but there is a favourable design in it towards you. A discreet child welcometh his father's rod, knowing, that being a father, he seeks his benefit thereby; and shall not God's children welcome the crook in their lot, as designed by their Father, who cannot mistake his measures to work for their good, according to the promise? The truth is, the crook in the lot of a believer, how painful soever it proves, is a part of the discipline of the covenant, the nurture secured by the promise of the Father to Christ's children, Psal. lxxxix. 30—32. "If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments, then will I visit their transgressions with the rod." Furthermore, all who are disposed to betake themselves to God under the crook in their lot, may take comfort in this: let them know there is no crook in their lot, but may be made straight; for God made it—surely then he can mend it. He himself can make straight what he hath made crooked, though none other can. There is nothing too hard for him to do: "He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, and lifteth the needy out of the dunghill; that he may set him with princes. He maketh the barren woman to keep house, and to be a joyful mother of children," Psalm cxiii. 7—9. Say not that your crook hath been of so long continuance, that it will never mend. Put it in the hand of God, who made it, that he may mend it, and wait on him; and if it be for thy good, that it should be mended, it shall be mended; for "no good thing will he withhold from them that walk uprightly," Psalm lxxxiv. 11.

Use last, Of *exhortation.* Since the crook in the lot is of God's making, then, viewing the hand of God in yours, be reconciled to it, and submit under it, whatever it is; I say, viewing the hand of God in it, for otherwise your submission under the crook in your lot cannot be a Christian submission, acceptable to God, having no reference to him as your party in the matter.

Object. I. But some will say, "The crook in my lot is from the hand of the creature; and such a one, too, as I deserved no such treatment from."

Ans. From what hath been already said, it appears that, although the crook in thy lot be indeed immediately from the creature's hand, yet it is mediately from the hand of God; there being nothing of that kind, no penal evil, but "the Lord hath done it." Therefore, without all peradventure, God himself is thy principal party, whoever be the less principal. And albeit thou hast not deserved thy crook at the hand of the instrument or instruments which he makes use of for thy correction, thou certainly deservest it at his hand; and he may make use of what instrument he will in the matter, or may do it immediately by himself, even as seems good in his sight.

Object. II. "But the crook in my lot might quickly be evened, if the instrument or instruments thereof pleased; only there is no dealing with them so as to convince them of their fault in making it."

Ans. If it is so, be sure God's time is not as yet come, that that crook should be evened; for if it were come, though they stand now like an impregnable fort, they would give way like a sandy bank under one's feet: they would "bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet," Isaiah, xlix. 23. Meanwhile, that state of the matter is so far from justifying one's not eyeing the hand of God in the crook in the lot, that it makes a piece of trial in which his hand very eminently appears, namely, that man should be signally injurious and burdensome to others, yet by no means susceptible of conviction. This was the trial of the church from her adversaries, Jer. l. 7, "All that found them have devoured them; and their adversaries said, We offend not: because they have sinned against the Lord, the habitation of justice." They were very abusive, and gave her barbarous usage; yet would they take with no fault in the matter. How could they ward off the conviction? Were they verily blameless in their devouring the Lord's straying sheep? No, surely, they were not. Did they look upon themselves as ministers of the divine justice against her? No, they did not.

Some, indeed, would make a question here, How the adversaries of the church could celebrate her God as the habitation of justice? But the original pointing of the text being retained, it appears, that there is no ground at all for this question here, and withal the whole matter is set in a clear light. "All that found them have devoured them; and their adversaries said, We offend not: because they have sinned against the Lord, the habitation of justice." These last are not the words of the adversaries, but the words of the prophet shewing how it came to pass that the adversaries devoured the Lord's sheep, as they lighted on them, and withal stood to the defence of it, when they had done, far from acknowledging any wrong; the matter lay here, the sheep had sinned against the Lord, the habitation of justice; and, as a just punishment hereof from his hand, they could have no justice at the hand of his adversaries.

Wherefore, laying aside these frivolous pretences, and eyeing the hand of God, as that which hath bowed your lot in that part, and keeps it in the bow, be reconciled to, and submit under the crook, whatever it is, saying from the heart, "Truly this is a grief, and I must bear it," Jer. x. 19. And to move you hereunto, consider,—

1. It is a duty you owe to God, as your sovereign Lord and benefactor. His sovereignty challengeth our submission; and it can in no case be meanness of spirit to submit unto the crook which his hand hath made in our lot, and to go quietly under the yoke that he hath laid on; but it is really madness for the potsherds of the earth, by their turbulent and refractory carriage under it, to strive with their Maker. And his beneficence to us, ill-deserving creatures, may well stop our mouths from our complaining of his making a crook in our lot, who had done us no wrong had he made the whole of it crooked: "Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?" Job, ii. 10.

2. It is an unalterable statute, for the time of this life, that nobody shall want a crook in their lot; for "man is born unto trouble as the sparks fly upward," Job, v. 7. And those who are designed for heaven, are in a special manner assured of a crook in theirs, that "in the world they shall have tribulation," John, xvi. 33; for by means thereof the Lord makes them meet for heaven. And how can you imagine that you shall be exempted from the common lot of mankind? "Shall the rock be removed out of his place for thee?" And since God makes the crooks in men's lot, according to the different exigence of their cases, you may be sure that yours is necessary for you.

3. A crook in the lot, which one can by no means submit to, makes a condition of all things the likest to that in hell. For there a yoke, which the wretched sufferers can neither bear nor shake off, is wreathed about their necks; there the almighty arm draws against them, and they against it; there they are ever suffering and ever sinning; still in the furnace, but their dross not consumed, nor they purified. Even such is the case of those who now cannot submit under the crook in their lot.

4. Great is the loss by not submitting under it. The crook in the lot, rightly improved, hath turned to the best account, and made the best time to some that ever they had all their life long, as the Psalmist from his own experience testifies, Psal. cxix. 67, "Before I was afflicted, I went astray; but now have I kept thy word." There are many now in heaven, who are blessing God for the crook they had in their lot here. What a sad thing must it then be to lose this fair wind for Immanuel's land! But if the crook in thy lot do thee no good, be sure it will not miss of doing thee great damage; it will hugely increase guilt, and aggravate thy condemnation, while it shall for ever cut to the heart, to think of the pains taken on thee, by means of the crook in the lot, to wean thee from the world, and bring thee to God, but all in vain. Take heed, therefore, how you manage it, "lest thou mourn at the last, and say, How have I hated instruction, and my heart despised reproof!" Prov. v. 10—12.

Doct. II. What God sees meet to mar, we shall not be able to mend, in our lot. What crook God makes in our lot, we shall not be able to even.

I. We shall shew God's marring and making a crook in one's lot, as he sees meet.

II. We shall consider men's attempting to mend, or even, that crook in their lot.

III. In what sense it is to be understood, that we shall not be able to mend, or even, the crook in our lot.

IV. Render some reasons of the point.

I. As to the first head, namely, shew God's marring and making a crook in one's lot, as he sees meet.

First, God keeps the choice of every one's crook to himself; and therein he exerts his sovereignty, Matth. xx. 15. It is not left to our option what that crook shall be, or what our peculiar burden; but, as the potter makes of the same clay one vessel for one use, another for another use; so God makes one crook for one, another for another, Psalm cxxxv. 6, "Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did he, in heaven and in earth," &c.

Secondly, He sees and observes the bias of every one's will and inclination, how it lies, and wherein it especially bends away from himself, and consequently, wherein it needs the special bow; so he did in that man's case, Mark, x. 21, "One thing thou lackest; go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor," &c. Observe the bent of his heart to his great possessions. He takes notice what is that idol that in every one's case is most apt to be his rival, that so he may suit the trial to the case, making the crook there.

Thirdly, By the conduct of his providence, or a touch of his hand, he gives that part of one's lot a bow the contrary way; so that henceforth it lies quite contrary to the bias of the party's will, Ezek. xxiv. 25. And here the trial is made, the bent of the will lying one way, and that part of one's lot another, that it does not answer the inclination of the party, but thwarts with it.

Lastly, He wills that crook in the lot to remain while he sees meet, for longer or shorter time, just according to his own holy ends he designs it for, 2 Sam. xii. 10; Hos. v. 15. By that will it is so fixed, that the whole creation cannot alter it, or put it out of the bow.

II. We shall consider men's attempting to mend, or even, that crook in their lot. This, in a word, lies in their making efforts to bring their lot in that point to their own will, that they may both go one way; so it imports three things:—

First, A certain uneasiness under the crook in the lot. It is a yoke which is hard for the party to bear till his spirit be tamed and subdued, Jer. xxxi. 18, "Thou hast chastised me, and I was chastised, as a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke; turn thou me, and I shall be turned," &c. And it is for the breaking down of the weight of one's spirit that God lays it on; for which cause it is declared to be a good thing to bear it, Lam. iii. 27, that being the way to make one at length as a weaned child.

Secondly, A strong desire to have the cross removed, and to have matters in that part going according to our inclinations. This is very natural, nature desiring to be freed from every thing that is burdensome or cross to it; and if that desire be kept in a due subordination to the will of God, and be not too peremptory, it is not sinful, Matt. xxvi. 39, "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will," &c. Hence so many accepted prayers of the people of God, for the removal of the crook in their lot.

Lastly, An earnest use of means for that end. This natively follows on that desire. The man, being pressed with the cross which is in his crook, labours all he can, in the use of means, to be rid of it. And if the means used be lawful, and not relied upon, but followed with an eye to God in them, the attempt is not sinful either, whether he succeed in the use of them or not.

III. In what sense it is to be understood, that we shall not be able to mend, or even, the crook in our lot.

Negatively, It is not to be understood, as if the case were absolutely hopeless, and that there is no remedy for the crook in the lot; for there is no case so desperate, but God may right it, Gen. xviii. 14, "Is any thing too hard for the Lord?" When the crook has continued long, and spurned all remedies one has used for it, one is ready to lose hope about it; but many a crook, given over for hopeless, that would never mend, God has made perfectly straight, as in Job's case.

But, *positively*, We shall never be able to mend it by ourselves; if the Lord himself take it not in hand to remove it, it will stand before us immoveable, like a mountain of brass, though perhaps it may be in itself a thing that might easily be removed. We take it up in these three things:—

1. It will never do by the mere force of our hand, 1 Sam. ii. 9, "For by strength shall no man prevail." The most vigorous endeavours we can use will not even the crook, if God gave it not a touch of his hand; so that all endeavours that way, without an eye to God, are vain and fruitless, and will be but ploughing on the rock, Psal. cxxvii. 1, 2.

2. The use of all allowable means for it will be successless, unless the Lord bless them for that end, Lam. iii. 37, "Who is he that saith, and it cometh to pass, when the Lord commandeth it not?" As one may eat, and not be satisfied, so one may use means proper for evening the crook in his lot, and yet prevail nothing; for nothing can be or do for us any more than God makes it to be or do, Eccl. ix. 11, "The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong; neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding," &c.

3. It will never do in our time, but in God's time, which seldom is so early as ours, John, vii. 6, "My time is not yet come, but your time is always ready." Hence that crook remains sometimes immoveable, as if it were kept by an invisible hand; and at another time it goes away with a touch, because God's time is come for evening it.

IV. We shall now assign the reasons of the point.

1*st*, Because of the absolute dependence we have upon God, Acts, xvii. 28. As the light depends on the sun, or the shadow on the body, so we depend on God, and without him can do nothing, great or small. And God will have us to find it so, to teach us our dependence.

2*dly*, Because his will is irresistible, Isa. xlvi. 10, " My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." When God wills one thing, and the creature the contrary, it is easy to see which will must be done. When the omnipotent arm holds, in vain does the creature draw, Job, ix. 4. " Who hath hardened himself against him and prospered?"

Inference 1. There is a necessity for yielding and submitting under the crook in our lot; for we may as well think to remove the rocks and mountains, which God has settled, as to make that part of our lot straight which he hath made crooked.

2. The evening the crook in our lot, by main force of our own, is but a cheat we put on ourselves, and will not last, but, like a stick, by main force made straight, it will quickly return to the bow again.

3. The only habile way of getting the crook evened, is to apply to God for it.

Exhortation 1. Let us then apply to God for removing any crook in our lot, that in the settled order of things may be removed. Men cannot cease to desire the removal of a crook, more than that of a thorn in the flesh; but, since we are not able to mend what God sees meet to mar, it is evident we are to apply to him that made it to mend it, and not take the evening of it in our own hand.

Motive 1. All our attempts for its removal will, without him, be vain and fruitless, Psal. cxxvii. 1. Let us be as resolute as we will to have it evened, if God say it not, we will labour in vain, Lam. iii. 37. Howsoever fair the means we use bid for it, they will be ineffectual if he command not the blessing, Eccl. ix. 11.

2. Such attempts will readily make it worse. Nothing is more ordinary, than for a proud spirit striving with the crook, to make it more crooked, Eccl. x. 8, 9, " Whoso breaketh a hedge, a serpent shall bite him. Whoso removeth stones, shall be hurt therewith," &c. This is evident in the case of the murmurers in the wilderness. It natively comes to be so; because, at that rate, the will of the party bends farther away from it: and, moreover, God is provoked to wreath the yoke faster about one's neck, that he will by no means let it sit easy on him.

3. There is no crook but what may be remedied by him, and made perfectly straight, Psal. cxlvi. 8, " The Lord raiseth them that are bowed down," &c. He can raise the oldest sit-fast, concerning which there remains no hope with us, Rom. iv. 17, " Who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were?" It is his prerogative to do wonders; to begin a work, where the whole creation gives it over as hopeless, and carry it on to perfection, Gen. xviii. 14.

4. He loves to be employed in evening crooks, and calls us to employ him that way, Psal. l. 15, " Call upon me in the day of trouble, and I will deliver thee," &c. He makes them for that very end, that he may bring us to him on that errand, and may manifest his power and goodness in evening them, Hos. v. 15. The straits of the children of men afford a large field for displaying his glorious perfections, which otherwise would be wanting, Exod. xv. 11.

5. A crook thus got evened is a double mercy. There are some crooks evened by a touch of the hand of common providence, while people are either not exercised about them, or when they fret for their removal; these are sapless mercies, and short-lived, Psal. lxxviii. 30, 31; Hos. xiii. 11. Fruits thus too hastily plucked off the tree of providence can hardly miss to set the teeth on edge, and will certainly be bitter to the gracious soul. But oh the sweets of the evening of the crook got by a humble application to, and waiting on the Lord! It has the image and superscription of divine favour upon it, which makes it bulky and valuable, Gen. xxxiii. 10, " For therefore I have seen thy face, as though I had seen the face of God," &c. chap. xxi. 6.

6. God has signalized his favour to his dearest children, in making and mending notable crooks in their lot. His darling ones ordinarily have the greatest crooks made in their lot, Heb. xii. 6. But then they make way for their richest experiences in the removal of them, upon their application to him. This is clear from the case of Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph. Which of the patriarchs had so great crooks as they? but which of them, on the other hand, had so signal tokens of the divine favour? The greatest of men, as Samson and the Baptist, have been born of women naturally barren; so do the greatest crooks issue in the richest mercies to them that are exercised thereby.

7. It is the shortest and surest way to go straight to God with the crook in the lot. If we would have our wish in that point, we must, as the eagle, first soar aloft, and then come down on the prey, Mark, v. 36. Our faithless out-of-the-way attempts to even the crook, are but our fool's haste, that is no speed; as in the case of Abraham's going in to Hagar. God is the first mover, who sets all the wheels in motion for evening the

crook, the which without him will remain immoveable, Hos. ii. 21, 22.

Object. 1. "But it is needless, for I see, that though the crook in my lot may mend, yet I will never mend. In its own nature it is capable of being removed, but it is plain it is not to be removed, it is hopeless."

Ans. That is the language of unbelieving haste, which faith and patience should correct, Psalm cxvi. 11, 12. Abraham had as much to say for the hopelessness of his crook, but yet he applies to God in faith for the mending of it, Rom. iv. 19, 20. Sarah had made such a conclusion, for which she was rebuked, Gen. xviii. 13, 14. Nothing can make it needless in such a case to apply to God.

Object. 2. "But I have applied to him again and again for it, yet it is never mended."

Ans. Delays are not denials of suits at the court of heaven, but trials of the faith and patience of the petitioners. And whoso will hang on will certainly succeed at long run. "And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them? I tell you that he will avenge them speedily," Luke, xviii. 7, 8. Sometimes indeed folks grow pettish, in the case of the crook in the lot, and let it drop out in their prayers, in a course of despondency, while yet it continues uneasy to them; but, if God mind to even it in mercy, he will oblige them to take it in again into them, Ezek. xxxvi. 37. "I will yet, for this, be inquired of by the house of Israel, to do it for them," &c. If the removal come, while it is dropped, there will be little comfort in it: though it were never to be removed while we live, that should not cut off our applying to God for the removal; for there are many prayers not to be answered till we come to the other world, and there all will be answered at once, Rom. vii. 24.

Directions for right managing the application for removing the crook in the lot.

1. *Pray* for it, Ezek. xxxvi. 37, and pray in faith, believing that, for the sake of Jesus, you shall certainly obtain at length, and in this life too, if it is good for you; but without peradventure in the other life, Matt. xxi. 22. They will not be disappointed that get the song of Moses and of the Lamb, Rev. xv. 3. And, in some cases of that nature, extraordinary prayer, with fasting, is very expedient, Matt. xvii. 21.

2. *Humble* yourselves under it, as the yoke which the sovereign hand has laid on you, Micah, vii. 9, "I will bear the indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against him." Justify God, condemn yourselves, kiss the rod, and go quietly under it; this is the most feasible way to get rid of it, James, iv. 10. When the bullock is broken and tamed, as accustomed to the yoke, then it is taken off, the end being obtained, Psal. x. 17, "Thou wilt prepare their hearts, thou wilt cause thine ear to hear."

3. Wait on *patiently* till the hand that made it mend it, Psal. xxvii. 14. Do not give up the matter as hopeless, because you are not so soon relieved as you would; "but let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing," James, i. 4. Leave the timing of the deliverance to the Lord; his time will at length, to conviction, appear the best, and it will not go beyond it, Isa. lx. 22, "I, the Lord, will hasten it in his time;" waiting on him, you will not be disappointed, "For they shall not be ashamed that wait for me," Isa. xlix. 23.

Exhortation 2. What crook there is, that, in the settled order of things, cannot be got removed or evened in this world, let us apply to God for suitable relief under it. For instance, the common crook in the lot of saints, namely, indwelling sin; as God has made that crook not to be removed here, he can certainly balance it, and afford relief under it. The same is to be said of any crook, while it remains unremoved. In both cases, apply yourself to God, for making up your losses another way. And there are five things I would have you to keep in view, and aim at here: —

1. To take God in Christ for, and instead of that thing, the withholding or taking away of which from you makes the crook in your lot, Psalm cxlii. 4, 5. There is never a crook God makes in our lot, but it is in effect heaven's offer of a blest exchange to us; such as Mark, x. 21, "Sell whatsoever thou hast, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." In managing of which exchange, God first puts out his hand, and takes away some earthly thing from us; and it is expected we put out our hand next, and take some heavenly thing from him in the stead of it, and particularly his Christ. Wherefore has God emptied your left hand of such and such an earthly comfort? Stretch out your right hand to God in Christ, take him in the room of it, and welcome. Therefore the soul's closing with Christ is called buying, wherein parting with one thing we get another in its stead. "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchantman seeking goodly pearls, who, when he had found one pearl of great price, he went and sold all that he had and bought it," Matt. xiii. 45, 46. Do this, and you will be more than even hands with the crook in your lot.

2. Look for the stream running as full from him as ever it did or could run, when the crook of the lot has dried it. This is the work of faith, confidently to hang on for that from God, which is denied us from the creature. "When my father and mother

forsake me, then the Lord will take me up," Psalm xxvii. 10. This is a most rational expectation; for it is certain there is no good in the creature but what is from God: therefore there is no good to be found in the creature, the stream, but what may be got immediately from God, the fountain. And oh! but it is a welcome plan, to come to God and say, Now, Lord, thou hast taken away from me such a creature comfort, I must have as good from thyself.

3. The spiritual fruits of the crook in the lot, Heb. xii. 11. We see the way in the world is, when one trade fails, to fall on and drive another; so should we, when there is a crook in the lot, making our earthly comforts low, set ourselves the more for spiritual attainments. If our trade with the world sinks, let us see to drive a trade with heaven more vigorously; see if, by means of the crook, we can reach more faith, love, heavenly-mindedness, contempt of the world, humility, self-denial, &c. 2 Cor. vi. 10. So, while we lose at one hand, we shall gain at another.

4. Grace to carry us up under the crook. "For this thing I besought the Lord thrice; and he said, My grace is sufficient for thee," 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9. Whether a man be faint, and have a light burden, or be refreshed, and strengthened, and have a heavy one, it is all a case; the latter can go as easy under his burden as the former under his. Grace proportioned to the trial is what we should aim at; getting that, though the crook be not evened, we are even hand with it.

5. The keeping in our eye the eternal rest and weight of glory in the other world, 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18, "For our light afflictions, which are but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things that are not seen." This will balance the crook in our lot, be it what it will; while they who have no well-grounded hope of salvation, will find the crook in their lot in this world such a weight, as they have nothing to counterbalance; yet the hope of eternal rest may bear up under all the toil and trouble met with here.

Exhortation 3. Let us then set ourselves rightly to bear and carry under the crook in our lot, while God sees meet to continue it. What we cannot mend, let us bear Christianly, and not fight against God, and so kick against the pricks. So let us bear it,

1. Patiently, without firing and fretting, or murmuring, James, v. 7; Psalm xxxvii. 7. Though we lose our comfort in the creature, through the crook in our lot, let us not lose the possession of ourselves, Luke, xxi. 19. The crook in our lot makes us like one who has but a scanty coldrife fire to warm at: but impatience under it scatters it, so as to set the house on fire about us, and exposeth us, Prov. xxv. 28, "He that hath no rule over his own spirit, is like a city that is broken down, and without walls."

2. With Christian fortitude, without sinking under discouragement,—"nor faint when thou art rebuked of him," Heb. xii. 5. Satan's work is by the crook, either to bend or break people's spirits, and oftentimes by bending to break them: our work is to carry evenly under it, steering a middle course, guarding against splitting on the rocks on either hand. Our happiness lies not in any earthly comfort, nor will the want of any of them render us miserable, Hab. iii. 17, 18. So that we are resolute to hold on our way with a holy contempt and regardlessness of the hardships, Job, xvii. 9, "The righteous also shall hold on his way, and he that hath clean hands shall be stronger and stronger."

Quest. When is one to be reckoned to fall under sinking discouragement from the crook in his lot?"

Ans. When it prevails so far as to unfit for the duties, either of our particular or Christian calling. We may be sure it has carried us beyond the bounds of moderate grief, when it unfits us for the common affairs of life, which the Lord calls us to manage, 1 Cor. vii. 24: see what is recorded to the commendation of Abraham, Gen. xxiii. 3, 4. Or for the duties of religion, hindering them altogether, 1 Pet. iii. 7, "That your prayers be not hindered," (Greek, cut off, or up, like a tree from the roots.) Or making one quite hopeless in them, Mal. ii. 13.

3. Profitably, so as we may gain some advantage thereby, Psal. cxix. 71, "It is good for me that I have been afflicted: that I might learn thy statutes." There is an advantage to be made thereby, Rom. v. 3—5. And it is certainly an ill-managed crook in our lot, when we get not some spiritual good of it, Heb. xi. 21. The crook is a kind of spiritual medicine; and as it is lost physic that purges away no ill humours, but in vain are its unpleasantness to the taste and its gripings endured; so it is a lost crook, and ill is the bitterness of it tasted, that we are not bettered by, Isa. xxvii. 9, "By this, therefore, shall the iniquity of Jacob be purged, and this is all the fruit, to take away his sin."

Motives to press this exhortation. Consider,

1. There will be no evening of it while God sees meet to continue it. Let us carry under it as we will, and make what sallies we please in the case, it will continue immoveable, as fixed with bands of iron and brass, Job, xxiii. 13, 14, "But he is in one mind, and who can turn him? And what his soul desireth, even that he doeth. For he performeth the thing that is appointed for me: and many such things are with him." Is it not wisdom

then to make the best we may of what we cannot mend? Make a virtue, then, of necessity. What is not to be cured must be endured, and should with a Christian resignation.

2. An awkward carriage under it notably increases the pain of it. What makes the yoke gall our necks, but that we struggle so much against it, and cannot let it sit at ease on us, Jer. xxxi. 18. How often are we, in that case, like men dashing their heads against a rock to remove it! The rock stands unmoved, but they are wounded, and lose exceedingly by their struggle. Impatience under the crook lays an over weight on the burden, and makes it heavier, while withal it weakens us, and makes us less able to bear it.

3. The crook in thy lot is the special trial God has chosen out for thee to take thy measure by, 1 Peter, i. 6, 7. It is God's fire, whereby he tries what metal men are of,—heaven's touchstone for discovering of true and counterfeit Christians. They may bear, and go through several trials, which the crook in the lot will discover to be naught, because by no means they can bear that, Mark, x. 21, 22. Think, then, with thyself under it,—Now, here the trial of my state turns; I must by this be proved either sincere, or a hypocrite; for, can any be a cordial subject of Christ, without being able to submit his lot to him? Do not all who sincerely come to Christ, put a blank in his hand? Acts, ix. 6; Psalm xlvii. 4. And does he not tell us that without that disposition we are not his disciples? Luke, xiv. 26, "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." Perhaps you find you submit to any thing but that; and will not that *but* mar all? Mark, x. 21. Did ever any hear of a sincere closing with Christ with a reserve or exception of one thing, wherein they behoved to be their own lords?

Quest. Is that disposition, then, a qualification necessarily pre-required to our believing? and if so, where must we have it? can we work it out of our natural powers?

Ans. No, it is not so: but it necessarily accompanies and goes along with believing, flowing from the same saving illumination in the knowledge of Christ, whereby the soul is brought to believe on him. Hereby the soul sees him an able Saviour, so trusts on him for salvation: the rightful Lord and wise Ruler, and so submits the lot to him, Matt. xiii. 45, 46. The soul taking him for a Saviour, takes him also for a head and ruler. It is Christ's giving himself to us, and our receiving him, that causes us to quit other things to and for him, as it is the light dispels the darkness.

Case. Alas! I cannot get my heart freely to submit my lot to him in that point.

Ans. 1. That submission will not be carried on in any without a struggle: the old man will never submit it, and when the new man of grace is submitting it, the old man will still be reclaiming, Gal. v. 17, "For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." But are ye sincerely desirous and habitually aiming to submit it? Do ye, from the ungracious struggle against the crook, turn away to the struggle with your own heart to bring it to submit, believing the promise, and using the means for it, being grieved from the heart with yourselves, that ye cannot submit it? This is submitting of your lot, in the favourable construction of the gospel, Rom. vii. 17—20; 2 Cor. viii. 12. If ye had your choice, would ye rather have your heart brought to submit to the crook, than the crook evened to your heart's desire? Rom. vii. 22, 23. And do ye not sincerely endeavour to submit it, notwithstanding the reluctance of the flesh? Gal. v. 17.

2. Where is the Christian self-denial, and taking up of the cross, without submitting to the crook? This is the first lesson Christ puts in the hands of his disciples, Matt. xvi. 24, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." Self-denial would procure a reconciliation with the crook, and an admittance of the cross: but while we cannot bear our corrupt self to be denied any of its cravings, and particularly that which God sees meet especially to be denied in, we cannot bear the crook in our lot, but fight against it in favour of self.

3. Where is our conformity to Christ, while we cannot submit to the crook? We cannot evidence ourselves Christians, without conformity to Christ. "He that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also to walk, even as he walked," 1 John, ii. 6. There was a continued crook in Christ's lot, but he submitted to it: Phil. ii. 8, "And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Rom. xv. 3, "For even Christ pleased not himself," &c. And so must we, if we will prove ourselves Christians indeed, Matt. xi. 29; 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12.

4. How will we prove ourselves the genuine kindly children of God, if still warring with the crook? We cannot pray, "Our Father, thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven," Matt. vi. Nay, the language of that practice is, we must have our own will, and God's will cannot satisfy us.

Motive 4. The trial by the crook here will not last long, 1 Cor. viii. 31. What though the work be sore, it may be the better comported with, that it will not be tedious; a few days or years at farthest, will put an end to it, and take you off your trials. Do not say, I shall never be eased of it; for if ye be not eased before, ye will be eased of it at death, come in the room of it after what will. A serious view of death and eternity might make us to set ourselves to carry rightly under our crook while it lasteth.

5. If ye would, in a Christian manner, set yourselves to bear the crook, ye would find it easier than ye imagine, Matt. xi. 29, 30, "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, and ye shall find rest to your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." Satan has no readier way to gain his purpose, than to persuade men it is impossible that ever their minds should ply with the crook; that it is a burden to them altogether insupportable. As long as you believe that, be sure ye will never be able to bear it. But the Lord makes no crook in the lot of any, but what may be so borne of them acceptably, though not sinlessly and perfectly, Matt. xi. 30. For their is strength for that effect secured in the covenant, 2 Cor. iii. 5—Phil. iv. 13; and being by faith fetched, it will certainly come, Ps. xxviii. 7.

6. If you act as Christians under your crook here, you will not lose your labour, but get a full reward of grace in the other world, through Christ, 2 Tim. ii. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 58. There is a blessing pronounced on him that endureth on this very ground; James, i. 12, "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for, when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life which the Lord hath promised to them that love him." Heaven is the place into which those approved, upon the trial of the crook, are received; Rom. vii. 14, "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." When you come there, no vestiges of it will be remaining in your lot, nor will ye have the least uneasy remembrance of it; but it will accent your praises, and increase your joy.

7. If you do not act as Christians under it, you will lose your souls in the other world, Jude, verse 15, 16. Those who are at war with God in their lot here, God will have war with them for ever. If they will not submit to his yoke here, and go quietly under it, he will wreath his yoke about their neck for ever, with everlasting bonds that shall never be loosed, Job, ix. 4.

Lastly, Whatever crook is in the lot of any, it is very likely there is a public crook abiding the generation, that will be more trying. This is a day of sinning, beyond the days of our fathers; a day wherein God is making great crooks in the lot of the dearest to himself; but these seem to presage such a general public crook to be abiding the generation, as will make our now private ones of very little weight, 1 Peter, iv. 17, 18, Therefore set yourselves to carry rightly under the crook in your lot.

If you ask what way one may reach that; for direction we propose

Doct. III.—The considering the crook in the lot, as the work of God, is a proper means to bring one to carry rightly under it.

I. What it is to consider the crook as the work of God, we take it up in these five things:

First, An inquiry into the spring whence it riseth, Gen. xxv. 22. Reason and religion both teach us, not only to notice the crook, which we cannot avoid, but to consider and inquire into the spring of it. Surely, it is not our choice, nor do we designedly make it for ourselves: and to ascribe it to fortune is to ascribe it to nothing: it is not sprung of itself, but sown by one hand or another for us, Job, v. 6; and we are to notice the hand from whence it comes.

Secondly, A perceiving of the hand of God in it. Whatever hand any creature hath therein, we ought not to terminate our view in them, but look above and beyond them to the supreme manager's agency therein, Job, i. 21. Without this we make a god of the creature instrumental of the crook, looking on it as if it were the first cause, which is peculiar to God, Rom. xi 36, and bring ourselves under that doom, Psalm xxviii. 5, "Because they regard not the works of the Lord, nor the operation of his hands, he shall destroy them, and not build them up."

Thirdly, A representing it to ourselves as a work of God which he hath wrought against us for holy and wise ends, becoming the divine perfections. This is to take it by the right handle, to represent it to ourselves under a right notion, from whence a right management under it may spring. It can never be safe to overlook God in it, but very safe to overlook the creature, ascribing it unto God, as if no other hand were in it, his being always the principal therein. "It is the Lord, let him do what seemeth him good," 1 Sam. iii. 18. Thus David overlooked Shimei, and looked to God in the matter of his cursing, as one would the axe, fixing his eye on him that wielded it. Here two things are to come into consideration.

1*st*, The decree of God, purposing that crook for us from eternity; "for he worketh all things by the counsel of his own will," Eph. i. 11, the sealed book, in which are written all the black lines that make the crook. Whatever valley of darkness, grief, and sorrow we are carried through, we are to look on them as made by the mountains of brass, the immoveable divine purposes, Zech.

vi. 1. This can be no presumption in that case, if we carry it no farther than the event goes in our sight and feeling; for so far the book is opened for us to look into.

2dly, The providence of God bringing to pass that crook for us in time, Amos, iii. 6. There is nothing can befall us without him in whom we live. Whatever kind of agency of the creatures may be in the making of our crook, whatever they have done or not done towards it, he is the spring that sets all the created wheels in motion, which ceasing, they would all stop: though he is still infinitely pure in his agency, however impure they be in theirs. Job considered both these, chap. xxiii. 14.

Fourthly, A continuing in the thought of it as such. It is not a simple glance of the eye, but a contemplating and leisurely viewing of it as his work, that is the proper mean. We are to be,

1*st*, Habitually impressed with this consideration: as the crook is some lasting grievance, so the consideration of this as the remedy should be habitually kept up. There are other considerations besides this that we must entertain, so that we cannot always have it expressly in our mind: but we must lay it down for a rooted principle, according to which we are to manage the crook, and keep the heart in a disposition, whereby it may slip into our minds as occasion calls expressly.

2dly, Occasionally exercised in it. Whenever we begin to feel the smart of the crook, we should fetch in this remedy; when the yoke begins to gall the neck, there should be an application of this spiritual ointment. And however often the former comes upon us, it will be our wisdom to fetch in the latter as the proper remedy; the oftener it is used, it will more easily come to hand, and also be the more effectual.

Fifthly, A considering it for the end for which it is proposed to us,—namely, to bring to a dutiful carriage under it. Men's corruptions will cause them to enter on this consideration: and as is the principle, so will the end and effect of it be corrupt, 2 Kings, vi. 33. But we must enter on, and use it for a good end, if we would have good of it, taking it as a practical consideration for regulating our conduct under the crook.

II. How it is to be understood to be a proper means to bring one to carry rightly under the crook.

1. *Negatively:* Not as if it were sufficient of itself, and as it stands alone, to produce that effect. But,

2. *Positively:* As it is used in faith, in the faith of the gospel; that is to say, a sinner's bare considering the crook in his lot as the work of God, without any saving relation to him, will never be a way to carry himself rightly under it: but having believed in Jesus Christ, and so taking God for his God, the considering of the crook as the work of God, his God, is the proper means to bring him to that desirable temper and behaviour. Many hearers mistake here. When they hear such and such lawful considerations proposed for bringing them to duty, they presently imagine, that by the mere force of them, they may gain the point: And many preachers, too, who, forgetting Christ and the gospel, pretend by the force of reason to make men Christians. The eyes of both being held, that they do not see the corruption of men's nature, which is such as sets the true cure above the force of reason; all that they are sensible of, being some ill habits, which they think may be shaken off by a vigorous application of their rational faculties. To clear this matter, consider,

First, Is it rational to think to set fallen man, with his corrupted nature, to work the same way with innocent Adam? that is, to set beggars on a level with the rich, lame men to a journey with them that have limbs. Innocent Adam had a stock of gracious abilities, whereby he might have, by the force of moral considerations, brought himself to perform duty aright. But where is that with us? 2 Cor. iii. 5. Whatever force be in them to a soul endowed with spiritual life, what force is in them to raise the dead, such as we are? Eph. ii. 1.

Secondly, The Scripture is very plain on this head, shewing the indispensable necessity of faith, Heb. xi; and that such as unites to Christ, John, xv. 5, "Without me," that is, separate from me, "ye can do nothing;" no, not with all the moral considerations ye can use. How were the ten commandments given on Mount Sinai? Not bare exactions of duty, but fronted with the gospel, to be believed in the first place, "I am the Lord thy God," &c. And so Solomon, whom many do regard rather as a moral philosopher than an inspired writer leading to Christ, fronts his writings, in the beginning of the Proverbs, with most express gospel. And we must have it expressly repeated in our Bibles with every moral precept, or else shut our eyes and take these precepts without it; that is the effect of our natural enmity to Christ. If we love him more, we should see him more in every page, and in every command, receiving the law at his mouth.

Thirdly, Do but consider what it is to carry ourselves rightly under the crook in the lot; what humiliation of soul, self-denial, and absolute resignation to the will of God, must be in it; what love to God it must proceed from, how regard to his glory must influence it as the chief end thereof; and try, and see if it is not impossible for you to reach it without that faith afore mentioned. I know a Christian may reach it without full assurance; but still, according to the measure of their persuasion that God is their God, so will their attainments in it be; these keep equal pace. Oh what kind of hearts do they imagine themselves to have, that think they can for a moment empty them of the creature, farther than they can fill them with a God as their God, in its room and stead! No doubt men may, from the force of moral considerations, work themselves to a behaviour under the crook, externally right, such as many Pagans had; but a Christian disposition of spirit under it will never be reached, without that faith in God.

Object. "Then it is saints only that are capable of the improvement of that consideration."

Ans. Yes, indeed, it is so, as to that and all other moral considerations, for true Christian ends: and that amounts to no more, than that directions for walking rightly are only for the living, that have the use of their limbs: and, therefore, that you may improve it, set yourselves to believe in the first place.

III. I shall confirm that it is a proper mean to bring one to carry rightly under it. This will appear, if we consider these four things.

1. It is of great use to divert from the considering and dwelling on those things about the crook, which serve to irritate our corruption. Such are the balking of our will and wishes, the satisfaction we would have in the matter's going according to our mind, the instruments of the crook, how injurious they are to us, how unreasonable, how obstinate, &c. The dwelling on these considerations, is but the blowing of fire within; but to turn our eyes to it as the work of God, would be a cure by way of diversion, 2 Sam. vi. 9, 10, and such diversion of the thoughts is not only lawful, but expedient and necessary.

2. It has a moral aptitude for producing the good effect. Though our cure is not compassed by the mere force of reason; yet it is carried on, not by a brutal movement, but in a rational way, Eph. v. 14. This consideration has a moral efficacy on our reason, it is fit to awe us into a submission, and ministers a deal of argument for carrying Christianity under our crook.

3. It hath a divine appointment on it for that end, which is to be believed, Prov. iii. 6. So the text. The creature in itself is an efficacious and moveless thing, a mere vanity, Acts, xvii. 28. What makes any thing a means fit for the end, is a word of divine appointment, Matt. iv. 4. To use any thing then for an end, without the faith of this, is to make a god of the creature; therefore, it is to be used in a dependence on God, according to that word of appointment, 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5. And every thing is fit for the end for which God has appointed it. This consideration is appointed for that end; and, therefore, is a fit means for it.

4. The Spirit may be expected to work by it, and does work by it in them that believe, and look to him for it, forasmuch as it is a mean of his own appointment. Papists, legalists, and all superstitious persons, devise various means of sanctification, seeming to have, or really having, a moral fitness for the same; but they are quite ineffectual, because, like Abana and Pharpar, they want a word of divine appointment for curing us of our leprosy; therefore the Spirit works not by them, since they are none of his own tools, but devised of their hearts. And since the means of divine appointment are ineffectual without the Spirit, these can never be effectual. But this consideration having a divine appointment, the Spirit works by it.

Use. Then take this direction for your carrying right under the crook in your lot. Inure yourselves to consider it as the work of God; and for helping you to improve it, so as it may be effectual, I offer these advices.

1. Consider it as the work of your God in Christ. This is the way to sprinkle it with gospel-grace, and so to make it tolerable, Psalm xxii. 1, 2, 3. The discerning of a Father's hand in the crook will take out much of the bitterness of it, and sugar the pill to you. For this cause it will be necessary, (1.) Solemnly to take God for your God, under your crook, Psalm cxliii. 4, 5, (2.) In all your encounters with it, resolutely to believe, and claim your interest in him, 1 Sam. xxx. 6.

2. Enlarge the consideration with a view of the divine relations to you, and the divine attributes. Consider it, being the work of your God, the work of your Father, elder Brother, Head, Husband, &c. who therefore surely consults your good. Consider his holiness and justice, shewing he wrongs you not; his mercy and goodness, that it is not worse; his sovereignty, that may silence you; his infinite wisdom and love, that may satisfy you in it.

3. Consider what a work of his it is,—how it is a convincing work, for bringing sin to remembrance; a correcting work, to chastise you for your follies; a preventing work, to hedge you up from courses of sin ye would otherwise be apt to run into; a trying work, to discover your state, your graces, and corruptions; a weaning work, to wean you from the world, and fit you for heaven.

4. In all your considerations of it, in this manner look upward for his Spirit to render them effectual, 1 Cor. iii. 6. Thus may you carry Christianly under it, till God even it either here or in heaven.

Better it is to be of a humble spirit with the lowly, than to divide the spoil with the proud.—Prov. xvi. 19.

Could men once be brought to believe, that it is better to have their minds brought to ply with the crook in their lot, than to force even the crook to their mind, they would then be in a fair way to bring their matters to a good account. Hear, then, the divine decision in that case:—"Better it is to be of a humble spirit with the lowly, than to divide the spoil with the proud." In which words,

First, There is a comparison instituted, and that between two parties and two points, wherein they vastly differ.

1*st*, The parties are the lowly and the proud, who differ as heaven and earth: the proud are climbing up and soaring aloft; the low are content to creep on the ground, if that is the will of God. Let us view them more particularly as the text represents them.

(1.) On the one hand is the lowly. Here there is a line reading and a marginal, both from the Holy Spirit, and they differ only in a letter. The former is the afflicted or poor, that are low in their condition; those that have a notable crook in their lot through affliction laid on them, whereby their condition is lowered in the world. The other is the lowly or meek humble ones, who are low in their spirits as well as their condition, and so have their minds brought down to their lot; both together making the character of this lowly party.

(2.) On the other hand is the proud, the gay, and high-minded ones. It is supposed here, that they are crossed too, and have crooks in their lot; for, dividing the spoil is the consequent of a victory, and a victory presupposes a battle.

2*d*, The points wherein these parties are supposed to differ; namely, being a humble spirit, and dividing the spoil.

Afflicted and lowly ones may sometimes get their condition changed, may be raised up on high, and divide the spoil, as Hannah, Job, &c. The proud may sometimes be thrown down and crushed, as Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar, &c. But that is not the question, Whether it is better to be raised up with the lowly, or thrown down with the proud? There would be no difficulty in determining that. But the question is, Whether it is better to be of a low and humble spirit, in low circumstances, with afflicted humble ones; or to divide the spoil, and get one's will, with the proud? If men would speak the native sentiments of their hearts, that question would be determined in a contradiction to the text. The points, then, here compared and set against another, are these:—

(1.) On the one hand, to be of a humble spirit with afflicted lowly ones, (Heb.) to be low of spirit; for the word primarily denotes lowness in situation or state; so the point here proposed is to be with or in the state of afflicted lowly ones, having the spirit brought down to that low lot; the lowness of the spirit balancing the lowness of one's condition.

(2.) On the other hand, to divide the spoil with the proud. The point here proposed is, to be with or in the state of the proud, having their lot by main force brought to their mind; as those who, taking themselves to be injured, fight it out with the enemy, overcome and divide the spoil according to their will.

Secondly, The decision made, wherein the former is preferred to the latter: "Better it is to be of a humble spirit with the lowly, than to divide the spoil with the proud," &c. If these two parties were set before us, it were better to take our lot with those of a low condition, who have their spirits brought as low as their lot, than with those, who being of a proud and high-bended spirit, have their lot brought up to their mind. A humble spirit is better than a heightened condition.

Doct. There is a generation of lowly afflicted ones, having their spirit lowered and brought down to their lot, whose case, in that respect, is better than that of the proud getting their will, and carrying all to their mind.

1. We shall consider the generation of the lowly afflicted ones, having their spirit brought down to their lot. And we shall,

First, Lay down some general considerations about them.

1. There is such a generation in the world as bad as the world is. The text expressly mentions them, and the Scripture elsewhere makes mention of them; as Psalm ix. 12, and x. 12. Matt. v. 3. with Luke, vi. 20. Where shall we seek them? Not in heaven, there are no afflicted ones there; nor in hell, there are no lowly or humble ones there, whose spirit is brought to their lot. In this world they must then be, where the state of trial is.

2. If it were not so, Christ, as he was in the world, would have no followers in it. He was the head of that generation whom they all copy after: "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart," Matt. xi. 29. And for his honour, and the honour of his cross, they will never be wanting while the world stands. Rom. viii. 29, "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son." His image lies in these two, suffering and holiness, whereof lowliness is a chief part.

3. Nevertheless they are certainly very rare in the world. Agur observes, that there is

another generation (Prov. xxx. 13, "Their eyes are lofty, and their eye-lids lifted up,") quite opposite to them, and this makes the greatest company by far. The low and afflicted lot is not so very rare, but the lowly disposition of spirit is rarely yoked with it. Many a high-bended spirit keeps on the bend in spite of the lowering circumstances.

4. They can be no more in number than the truly godly; for nothing less than the power of divine grace can bring down men's minds from their native height, and make their will pliant to the will of God, 2 Cor. x. 4, 5. Men may put on a face of submission to a low and a crossed lot, because they cannot help it, and they see it is in vain to strive; but to bring the spirit truly to it, must be the effect of humbling grace.

5. Though all the godly are of that generation, yet there are some of them to whom that character more especially belongs. The way to heaven lies through tribulation to all, Acts, xiv. 22, and all Christ's followers are reconciled to it notwithstanding, Luke, xiv. 26, yet there are some of them more remarkably disciplined than others, whose spirit, however, is hereby humbled and brought down to their lot. Psalm cxxxi. 2, "Surely I have behaved and acquitted myself as a child that is weaned of his mother; my soul is even as a weaned child." Phil. iv. 11, 12, "For I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content. I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound: everywhere, and in all things, I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need."

6. A lowly disposition of soul, and habitual aim and bent of the heart that way, has a very favourable construction put upon it in heaven. Should we look for a generation perfectly purged of pride and risings of heart against their adverse lot at any time, we should find none in this world; but those who are sincerely aiming and endeavouring to reach it, and keep the way of contented submission, though sometimes they are blown aside, returning to it again, God accounts to be that lowly generation, 2 Cor. vii. 10, 11; James, v. 11.

Secondly, We shall enter into the particulars of their character. There are three things which, together, make up their character.

1*st*, Affliction in their lot. That lowly generation, preferred to the proud and prosperous, are a generation of afflicted ones, whom God keeps under the discipline of the covenant. We may take it up in these two:—

1. There is a yoke of affliction of one kind or other oftentimes upon them, Psalm lxxiii. 14. If there be silence in heaven, it is but for half an hour, Rev. viii. 1. God is frequently visiting them as a master doth his scholars, and a physician his patients; whereas others are in a sort overlooked by him, Rev. iii. 19. They are accustomed to the yoke, and that from the time they enter into God's family, Psalm cxxix. 1, 2, 3. God sees it good for them, Lam. iii. 27, 28.

2. There is a particular yoke of affliction which God has chosen for them, that hangs about them, and is seldom, if ever, taken off them, Luke, ix. 23. That is their special trial, the crook in their lot, the yoke which lies on them for their constant exercise. The other trials may be exchanged, but that is a weight that still hangs about them, bowing them down.

2*dly*, Lowliness in their disposition and tenor of spirit. They are a generation of lowly humble ones, whose spirits God has, by his grace, brought down from their natural height. And thus,—

1. They think soberly and meanly of themselves; what they are, 2 Cor. xii. 9, 10, what they can do, 2 Cor. iii. 5, what they are worth, Gen. xxxii. 10, and what they deserve, Lam. iii. 22. Viewing themselves in the glass of the divine law and perfections, they see themselves as a mass of imperfection and sinfulness, Job, xlii. 5, 6.

2. They think highly and honourably of God, Psalm, cxlv. 3. They are taught by the Spirit what God is; and so entertain elevated thoughts of him. They consider him as the Sovereign of the world; his perfections as infinite; his work as perfect. They look on him as the fountain of happiness, as a God in Christ doing all things well; trusting his wisdom, goodness, and love, even where they cannot see, Heb. xi. 8.

3. They think favourably of others, as far as in justice they may, Phil. ii. 3. Though they cannot avoid seeing their glaring faults, yet they are ready withal to acknowledge their excellencies, and esteem them so far. And because they see more into their own mercies and advantages for holiness, and misimproving thereof, than they can see into others, they are apt to look on others as better than themselves, all circumstances compared.

4. They are sunk down into a state of subordination to God and his will, Psalm cxxxi. 1, 2. Pride sets a man up against God, lowliness brings him back to his place, and lays him down at the feet of his sovereign Lord, saying, "Thy will be done on earth," &c. They seek no more the command, but are content that God himself sit at the helm of their affairs, and manage all for them, Psalm xlvii. 4.

5. They are not bent on high things, but disposed to stoop to low things, Psa. cxxxi. 1. Lowliness levels the towering imaginations, which pride mounts up against heaven; draws a veil over all personal worth and excellencies before the Lord, and yields a man's

all to the Lord, to be as stepping stones to the throne of his glory, 2 Sam. xv. 25, 26.

6. They are apt to magnify mercies bestowed on them, Gen xxvii. 10. Pride of heart overlooks and vilifies mercies one is possessed of, and fixeth the eye on what is wanting in one's condition, making one like the flies, which pass over the sound places, and swarm together on the sore. On the contrary, lowliness teaches men to recount the mercies they enjoy in the lowest condition, and to set a mark on the good things they possess, Job, ii. 10.

3dly, A spirit brought down to their lot. Their lot is a low and afflicted one; but their spirit is as low, being, through grace, brought down to it. We may take it up in these five things.

1. They submit to it as just, Mic. vii. 9. "I will bear the indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against him." There are no hardships in our condition, but we have procured them to ourselves; and it is therefore just we kiss the rod, and be silent under it, and so lower our spirits to our lot. If they complain, they have their complaints on themselves; their hearts rise not up against the Lord, far less do they open their mouths against the heavens. They justify God, and condemn themselves, reverencing his holiness and spotless righteousness in his proceedings against them.

2. They go quietly under it as tolerable, Lam. iii. 26—29, "It is good that a man should both hope and quietly wait for the salvation of the Lord. It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth. He sitteth alone, and keepeth silence, because he hath borne it upon him: he putteth his mouth in the dust, if so be there may be hope." While the unsubdued spirit rageth under the yoke as a bullock unaccustomed to it, the spirit brought to the lot, goes softly under it. They see it is of the Lord's mercies that it is not worse; they take up the naked cross, as God lays it down, without those over-weights upon it that turbulent passions add thereunto; and so it becomes really more easy than they thought it could have been, like a burden fitted to the back.

3. They are satisfied in it, as drawing their comfort from another than their outward condition, even as the house stands fast, when the prop is taken away that it did not lean upon. "Although the fig-tree should not blossom, neither fruit be in the vines, yet I will rejoice in the Lord," Hab. iii. 17, 18. Thus did David in the day of his distress, "he encouraged himself in the Lord his God," 1 Sam. xxx. 6. It is an argument of a spirit not brought down to the lot, when men are damped and sunk under the hardships of it, as if their condition in the world were the point whereon their happiness turned. It is want of mortification that makes their comforts to wax and wane, ebb and flow, according to the various appearances of their lot in the world.

4. They have a complacency in it, as that which is fit and good for them, Isa. xxxix. 8; 2 Cor. xii. 10. Men have a sort of complacency in the working of physic, though it may be painful; they rationally think with themselves that it is good and best for them: so these lowly souls consider their afflicted lot as a spiritual medicine, necessary, fit and good for them; yea, best for them for the time, since it is ministered by their heavenly Father; and so they reach a holy complacency in their low afflicted lot.

The lowly spirit extracts this sweet out of the bitterness in his lot, considering how the Lord, by means of that afflicting lot, stops the provision for unruly lusts, that they may be starved; how he cuts off the bye-channels, that the whole stream of the soul's love may run towards himself; how he pulls off, and holds off the man's burden and clog of earthly comforts, that he may run the more expeditiously the way to heaven.

5. They rest in it, as what they desire not to come out of, till the God that brought them into it, see it meet to bring them out with his good will, Isa. xxviii. 16. Though an unsubdued spirit's time for deliverance is always ready, a humble soul will be afraid of being taken out of its afflicted lot too soon. It will not be for moving for a change, till the moving of the heavens bring it about; so this hinders not prayer, and the use of appointed means, with dependence on the Lord; but requires faith, hope, patience, and resignation, 2 Sam. xv. 25, 26.

II. We shall consider the generation of the proud getting their will, and carrying all to their mind. And in their character also are three things:—

First, There are crosses in their lot. They also have their trials allotted them by overruling Providence, and let them be in what circumstances they will in the world, they cannot miss them altogether. For consider,

1. The confusion and vanity brought into the creation by man's sin, have made it impossible to get through the world, but men must meet with what will ruffle them, Eccl. i. 14. Sin has turned the world from a paradise into a thicket, there is no getting through without being scratched. As gnats in the summer will fly about those walking in a goodly attire, as well as about those in sordid apparel; so will crosses in the world meet with the high as well as the low.

2. The pride of their heart exposes them particularly to crosses. A proud heart will make a cross to itself, where a lowly soul will find none, Esth. v. 13. It will make a real cross ten times the weight it would be to the

humble. The generation of the proud are like nettles and thorn hedges, upon which things flying about do fix, while they pass over low and plain things: so none are more exposed to crosses than they, though none so unfit to bear them; as appears from,—

Secondly, Reigning pride in their spirit. Their spirits were never subdued by a work of thorough humiliation, they remain at the height in which the corruption of nature sets them: hence they can by no means bear the yoke God lays on them. The neck is swollen with the ill humours of pride and passion; hence, when the yoke once begins to touch it, they cannot have any more ease. We may view the case of the proud generation here in three things:—

1. They have an over-value for themselves; and so the proud mind says, The man should not stoop to the yoke; it is below him. What a swelling vanity is in that! Exod. v. 2, "Who is the Lord that I should obey his voice?" Hence a work of humiliation is necessary to make one take the yoke, whether of Christ's precepts or providence. The first error is in the understanding; whence Solomon ordinarily calls a wicked man a fool; accordingly, the first stroke in conversion is there too, by conviction to humble. Men are bigger in their own conceit, than they are indeed; therefore God, suiting things to what we are really, cannot please us.

2. They have an unmortified self-will, arising from that over-value for themselves; and it says, He will not stoop, Exod. v. 2. The question betwixt heaven and us is, Whether God's will or our own must carry it? Our will is corrupt, God's will is holy; they cannot agree in one. God says in his providence, our will must yield to his; but that it will not do, till the iron sinew in it be broken, Rom. viii. 7; Isa. xlviii. 4.

3. They have a crowd of unsubdued passions taking part with the self-will; and they say, He shall not stoop, Rom. vii. 8, 9; and so the war begins, and there is a field of battle within and without the man, James, iv. 1.

(1.) A holy God crosses the self-will of the proud creatures by his providence overruling and disposing of things contrary to his inclination; sometimes by his own immediate hand, as in the case of Cain, Gen. iv. 4, 5, sometimes by the hand of men carrying things against their mind, as in the case of Ahab, to whom Naboth refused his vineyard, 1 Kings, xxi. 4.

(2.) The proud heart and will, unable to submit to the cross, or to bear to be controlled, rises up against it, and fights for the mastery, with its whole force of unmortified passions. The design is to remove the cross, even the crook, and bring the thing to their own mind: this is the cause of this unholy war, in which,

1. There is one black band of hellish passions that marches upwards, and makes an attack on heaven itself, namely, discontent, impatience, murmuring, frettings, and the like. "The foolishness of man perverteth his way: and his heart fretteth against the Lord," Prov. xix. 3. These fire the breast, cause the countenance to fall, Gen. iv. 6, let off sometimes a volley of indecent and passionate complaints, Jude, ver. 16, and sometimes of blasphemies, 2 Kings, vi. 33.

2. There is another that marches forward, and makes an attack on the instrument or instruments of the cross, namely, anger, wrath, fury, revenge, bitterness, &c. Prov. xxvii. 4. These carry the man out of the possession of himself, Luke, xxi. 19, fill the heart with a boiling heat, Psal. xxxix. 3, the mouth with clamour and evil-speaking, Eph. iv. 31, and threatenings are breathed out, Acts, ix. 1, and sometimes set the hands on work, which has a most heavy event, as in the case of Ahab against Naboth.

Thus the proud carry on the war, but oftentimes they lose the day, and the cross remains immoveable for all they can do; yea, and sometimes they themselves fall in the quarrel, it ends in their ruin, Exod. xv. 9, 10. But that is not the case in the text. We are to consider them as,

Thirdly, Getting their *will*, and carrying all to their mind. This speaks,

1. Holy Providence yielding to the man's unmortified self-will, and letting it go according to his mind, Gen. vi. 3. God sees it meet to let the struggle with him fall, for it prevails not to his good, Isa. i. 5. So the reins are laid on the proud man's neck, and he has what he would be at; "Ephraim is joined to idols, let him alone," Hos. iv. 17.

2. The lust remaining in its strength and vigour, Psal. lxxxviii. 30, "They were not estranged from their lust." God, in the method of his covenant, sometimes gives his people their will, and sets them where they would be; but then, in that case, the lust for the thing is mortified, and they are as weaned children, Psalm x. 17. But here the lust remains rampant: the proud seek meat for it, and get it.

3. The cross removed, the yoke taken off, Psalm lxxxviii. 29. They could not think of bringing their mind to their lot; but they thwarted with it, wrestled and fought against it, till it is brought up to their mind: so the day is their own, the victory is on their side.

4. The man is pleased at having carried his point, even as one is when he is dividing the spoil, 1 Kings, xxi. 18, 19.

Thus the case of the afflicted lowly generation, and the proud generation prospering, is stated. Now,

III. I am to confirm the doctrine, or the decision of the text, That the case of the former is better than that of the latter. It is better to be in a low afflicted condition, with the spirit humbled and brought down to the lot, than to be of a proud and high spirit, getting the lot brought up to it, and matters go to will and wish, according to one's mind. This will appear from the following considerations.

1*st*, Humility is so far preferable to pride, that in no circumstances whatsoever its preferableness can fail. Let all the afflictions in the world attend the humble spirit, and all the prosperity in the world attend pride, humility will still have the better: as gold in a dunghill is more excellent than so much lead in a cabinet: For,

1. Humility is a part of the image of God. Pride is the master-piece of the image of the devil. Let us view him who was the express image of the Father's person, and we shall behold him "meek and lowly in heart," Matt. xi. 29. None more afflicted, yet his spirit perfectly brought down to his lot, Isa. liii. 7, "He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth." That is a shining piece of the divine image: for though God cannot be low in respect of his state and condition, yet he is of infinite condescension, Isaiah, lvii. 15. None bears as he, Rom. ii. 4, nor suffers patiently so much contradiction to his will, which is proposed to us for our encouragement in affliction, as it shone in Christ. "For consider him that endureth such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds," Heb. xii. 3.

Pride, on the other hand, is the very image of the devil, 1 Tim. iii. 6. Shall we value ourselves on the height of our spirits? Satan will vie with the highest of us in that point; for though he is the most miserable, yet he is the proudest in the whole creation. There is the greatest distance between his spirit and his lot; the former is as high as the throne of God, the latter as low as hell: and as it is impossible that ever his lot should be brought up to his spirit; so his spirit will never come down to his lot: and therefore he will be eternally in a state of war with his lot. Hence, even at this time, he has no rest, but goes about, seeking his rest indeed, but finding none.

Now, is it not better to be like God than like the devil? Like him who is the fountain of all good, than him who is the spring and sink of all evil? Can any thing possibly cast the balance here, and turn the preference to the other side? "Then better it is to be of a humble spirit with the lowly," &c.

2. Humility and lowliness of spirit qualify us for friendly communion and intercourse with God in Christ. Pride makes God our enemy, 1 Pet. v. 5. Our happiness here and hereafter depends on our friendly intercourse with heaven. If we have not that, nothing can make up our loss, Psal. xxx. 5. If we have that, nothing can make us miserable, Rom. viii. 31, "If God be for us, who can be against us?" Now, who are they whom God is for but the humble and lowly? they who, being in Christ, are so made like him? He blesses them, and declares them the heirs of the crown of glory: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," Matt. v. 3. He will look to them, be their condition ever so low, while he overlooks others, Isa. lxvi. 2. He will have respect to them, however they be despised: "Though the Lord be high, yet hath he respect to the lowly; but the proud he knoweth afar off," Psalm cxxxviii. 6. He will dwell with them, however poorly they dwell, Isa. lvii. 15. He will certainly exalt them in due time, however low they lie now, Isa. xl. 4.

Whom is he against? Whom does he resist? The proud. Them he curseth, Jer. xvii. 5, and that curse will dry up their arm at length. The proud man is God's rival; he makes himself his own God, and would have those about him make him theirs too; he rages, he blusters if they will not fall down before him. But God will bring him down, Isa. xl. 4; Psalm xviii. 27.

Now, is it not better to be qualified for communion with God, than to have him engaged against us, at any rate?

3. Humility is a duty pleasing to God, pride a sin pleasing to the devil, Isa. lvii. 15; 1 Tim. iii. 6. God requires us to be humble, especially under affliction, "and to be clothed with humility," 1 Pet. v. 5, 6. That is our becoming garment. The humble Publican was accepted, the proud Pharisee rejected. We may say of the generation of the proud, as 1 Thess. ii. 16, "Wrath is come upon them to the uttermost." They please neither God nor men, but only themselves and Satan, whom they resemble in it. Now, duty is better than sin at any rate.

2*dly*, They whose spirits are brought down to their afflicted lot, have much quiet and repose of mind, while the proud, that must have their lot brought up to their mind, have much disquiet, trouble and vexation. Consider here, that, on the one hand,

1. Quiet of mind, and ease within, is a great blessing, upon which the comfort of life depends. Nothing without this can make one's life happy, Dan. v. 6. And where this is maintained nothing can make it miserable, John, xvi. 33. This being secured in God, there is a defiance bid to all the troubles of the world, Psalm xlvi. 2—4. Like the child sailing in the midst of the rolling waves.

2. The spirit brought down to the lot makes and maintains this inward tranquillity. Our whole trouble in our lot in the world riseth from the disagreement of our mind

therewith; let the mind be brought to the lot, and the whole tumult is instantly hushed; let it be kept in that disposition, and the man shall stand at ease in his affliction, like a rock unmoved with waters beating on it, Col. iii. 15. "And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called."

On the other hand consider,

1. What disquiet of mind the proud do suffer ere they can get their lot brought up to their mind. "They have taught their tongues to speak lies, and they weary themselves to commit iniquity," Jer. ix. 5; James, iv. 2, "Ye lust, and have not; ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain; ye fight and war, yet ye have not." What arrows of grief go through their heart! what torture of anxiety, fretting, and vexation, must they endure! what contrary passions fight within them! and what sallies of passions do they make! what uneasiness was Haman in, before he could carry the point of the revenge against Mordecai, obtaining the king's decree.

2. When the thing is got to their mind, it will not quit the cost. The enjoyment thereof brings not so much satisfaction and pleasure, as the want of it gave pain. This was evident in Rachel's case, as to the having of children; and in that case, Psalm lxxviii. 30, 31. There is a dead fly in the ointment that mars the savour they expected to find in it. Fruit plucked off the tree of providence, ere it is ripe, will readily set the teeth on edge. It proves like the manna kept over night, Exod. xvi. 20.

3. They have but an unsure hold of it; it doth not last with them. Either it is taken from them soon, and they are as just where they were again: "I gave thee a king in my anger, and took him away in my wrath," Hos. xiii. 11. Having a root of pride, it quickly withers away; or else they are taken from it, that they have no access to enjoy it. So Haman obtained the decree; but ere the day of the execution came he was gone.

3dly, They that get their spirit brought down to their afflicted lot, do gain a point far more valuable than they who in their pride force up their lot to their mind, Prov. xvi. 32, "He that is slow to anger, is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit, than he that taketh a city." This will appear, if you consider,

1. The latter makes but a better condition in outward things, the former makes a better man. "The life is more than meat." The man himself is more valuable than all external conveniences that attend him. What therefore betters the man is preferable to what betters only his condition. Who doubts, but where two are sick, and the one gets himself transported from a coarse bed to a fine one, but the sickness still remaining—the other lies still in the coarse bed, but the sickness is removed,—that the case of the latter is preferable? So it is here.

2. The subduing of our own passion is more excellent than to have the whole world subdued to our will: for then we are masters of ourselves, according to that, Luke, xxi. 19. Whereas, in the other case, we are still slaves to the worst of masters, Rom. vi. 16. In the one case we are safe, blow what storm will: in the other, we lie exposed to thousands of dangers; Prov. xxv. 28, "He that hath no rule over his own spirit, is like a city that is broken down, and without walls."

3. When both shall come to be judged, it will appear the one has multiplied the tale of their good works, in bringing their spirit to their lot; the other, the tale of their ill works, in bringing their lot to their spirit. We have to do with an omniscient God, in whose eyes every internal action is a work, good or bad, to be reckoned for, Rom. ii. 16.

An afflicted lot is painful, but, where it is well managed, it is very fruitful; it exercises the graces of the Spirit in a Christian, which otherwise would lie dormant. But there is never an act of resignation to the will of God under the cross, nor an act of trusting in him for his help, but they will be recorded in heaven's register as good works, Mal. iii. 16. And these are occasioned by affliction.

On the other hand, there is never a rising of the proud heart against the lot, nor a faithless attempt to bring it to our mind, whether it succeed or not, but it passes for an ill work before God. How then will the tale of such be multiplied by the war in which the spoil is divided!

Use 1. Of information. Hence we may learn,

1. It is not always best for folk to get their will. Many there are who cannot be pleased with God's will about them, and they get their own will with a vengeance. Psalm lxxxi. 11, 12, "Israel would none of me, so I gave them up to their own heart's lust; and they walked in their own counsels." It may be most pleasant and grateful for the time, but it is not the safest. Let not people pride themselves in their carrying things that way, then, by strong hand; let them not triumph on such victory; the after-reckoning will open their eyes.

2. The afflicted crossed party, whose lot is kept low, is so far from being a loser, that he is a gainer thereby, if his spirit is brought down to it. And if he will see things in the light of God's unerring word, he is in better case than if he had got all carried to his mind. In the one way, the vessels of wrath are fitted for destruction, Psal. lxxviii. 22, 30, 31. In the other, the vessels of mercy are fitted for glory, and so God disciplines his own, Lam. iii. 27.

3. It is better to yield to Providence than

to fight it out, though we should win. Yielding to the sovereign disposal is both our becoming duty and our greatest interest. Taking that way, we act most honourably; for what honour can there be in the creature's disputing his ground with his Creator? And we act most wisely; for whatever may be the success of some battles in that case, we may be sure victory will be on heaven's side in the war, 1 Sam. ii. 9, "For by strength shall no man prevail."

Lastly, It is of far greater concern for us to get our spirit brought down, than our outward condition raised. But who believes this? All men strive to raise their outward condition; most men never mind the bringing down of their spirit, and few there are who apply themselves to it. And what is that but to be concerned to minister drink to the thirsty sick, but never to mind to seek a cure for them, whereby their thirst may be carried off?

Use 2. Of exhortation. As you meet with crosses in your lot in the world, let your bent be rather to have your spirit humbled and brought down, than to get the cross removed. I mean not but that you may use all lawful means for the removal of your cross, in dependence on God; but only that you may be more concerned to get your spirit to bow and ply, than to get the crook in your lot evened.

Motive 1. It is far more needful for us to have our spirits humbled under the cross, than to have the cross removed. The removal of the cross is needful only for the ease of the flesh, the humbling for the profit of our souls, to purify them, and bring them into a state of health and cure.

2. The humbling of the spirit will have a mighty good effect on a crossed lot, but the removal of the cross will have none on the unhumbled spirit. The humbling will lighten the cross mightily for the time, Matt. xi. 30, and in due time carry it cleanly off, 1 Peter, v. 6. But the removal of the cross is not a means to humble the unhumbled; though it may prevent irritation, yet the disease still remains.

3. Think with yourselves how dangerous and hopeless a case it is to have the cross removed ere the spirit is humbled; that is, to have the means of cure pulled away and blocked up from us, while the power of the disease is yet unbroken; to be taken off trials ere we have given any good proof of ourselves, and so to be given over of our physician as hopeless, Isaiah, i. 5; Hos. iv. 17.

Use 3. For direction. Believing the gospel, take God for your God in Christ towards your eternal salvation, and then dwell much on the thoughts of God's greatness and holiness, and of your own sinfulness; so will you be "humbled under the mighty hand of God;" and, in due time, "he will lift you up."

Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time. — 1 Peter, v. 6.

In the preceding part of this chapter, the apostle presseth the duties of the church officers towards the people; and the duty of the people, both towards their officers and among themselves, which he winds up in one word, *submission*. For which causes he recommends humility as the great means to bring all to their respective duties. This is enforced with an argument taken from the different treatment the Lord gives to the proud and humble; his opposing himself to the one, and shewing favour to the other. Our text is an exhortation drawn from that consideration; and in it we have,

1*st*, The duty we are therefore to study: "humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time." And therein we may notice,

1. The state of those whom it is proposed to, those "under the mighty hand of God," whom his hand has humbled, or brought low in respect of their circumstances in the world. And by these are, I think, meant, not only such as are under particular signal afflictions, which is the lot of some, but also those who, by the providence of God, are any manner of way lowered, which is the lot of all. All being in a state of submission or dependence on others, God has made this life a state of trial; and for that cause he has, by his mighty hand, subjected men one to another, as wives, children, servants, to husbands, parents, masters; and these again to their superiors; among whom again even the highest depend on those under them, as magistrates and ministers on the people, even the supreme magistrate being *major singulis, minor universis.* This state of the world God has made for taking trial of men in their several stations and dependence on others; and, therefore, when the time of trial is over, it also comes to an end. "Then cometh the end, when he shall have put down all rule, and authority, and power," 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25. Meantime, while it lasts, it makes humility necessary to all, to prompt them to the duty they owe their superiors, to whom God's mighty hand has subjected them.

2. The duty itself, — namely, Humiliation of our spirits under the humbling circumstances the Lord has placed us in. "Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time." Whether it is we are under particular afflictions, which have cast us down from the height we were sometimes in, or whether we are only inferiors in one or more relations; or whether, which is most common, both these are in our case, we must therein eye the mighty hand of God, as that which placed

us there, and is over us there, to hold us down in it; and so, with an awful regard thereto, crouch down under it, in the temper and disposition of our spirits, suiting our spirits to our lot, and careful of performing the duty of our low sphere.

3. A particular spring of this duty; therefore we must consider, that those who cannot quietly keep the place assigned them of God in their afflictions or relations, but still press upward against the mighty hand that is over them, that mighty hand resists them, throwing them down, and often farther down than before; whereas it treats them with grace and favour that compose themselves under it, to a quiet discharge of their duty in their situation; so, eyeing this, we must set ourselves to humble ourselves.

2*dly*, The infallible issue of that course, "that he may exalt you in due time." The particle *that*, is not always to be understood finally, as denoting the end or design the agent proposes to himself, but sometimes eventually only, as denoting the event or issue of the action, John, ix. 2, 3; 1 John, ii. 19. So here, the meaning is not, "Humble yourselves," on design "he may exalt you;" but, and it shall issue in his exalting you. Compare James, iv. 10.

(1.) Here is a happy event of humiliation of spirit secured, and that is exaltation or lifting up on high, by the power of God, "that he may exalt you." Exalting will as surely follow on humiliation of spirit, suitable to the low lot, as the morning follows the night, or the sun riseth after the dawning. And these words are fitted to obviate the objections that the world and our corrupt hearts are apt to make against bringing down the spirit to the low lot.

Object. 1. If we let our spirit fall, we shall lie always among folk's feet, and they will trample on us.

Ans. No; pride of spirit unsubdued, will bring men to lie among the feet of others for ever, Isaiah, lxvi. 24. But humiliation of spirit will bring them undoubtedly out from among their feet, Mal. iv. 2, 3. They that humble themselves now will be exalted for ever; they will be brought out of their low situation and circumstances. Cast ye yourselves even down with your low lot, and assure yourselves ye shall not lie there.

Object. 2. If we do not raise ourselves, none will raise us; and, therefore, we must see to ourselves, to do ourselves right.

Ans. That is wrong. Humble ye yourselves in respect of your spirits, and God will raise you up in respect of your lot, or low condition; and they that have God engaged for raising them, have no reason to say they have none to do it for them. Bringing down of the spirit is our duty, raising us up is God's work; let us not forfeit the privilege of God's raising us up, by arrogating that work to ourselves, taking it out of his hand.

Object. 3. But sure we shall never rise high, if we let our spirits fall.

Ans. That is wrong too: God will not only raise the humble ones, but he will lift them up on high, for so the word signifies. They shall be as high at length as ever they were low, were they ever so low; nay, the exaltation will bear proportion to the humiliation.

(2.) Here is the date of that happy event, when it will fall out. In due time, or in the season, the proper season for it, Gal. vi. 9, "In due season we shall reap if we faint not." We are apt to weary in humbling trying circumstances, and would always be on the advance, John, vii. 6. But Solomon observes, there is a time for every thing when it does best, and the wise shall wait for it, Eccl. iii. 1—8. There is a time, too, for exalting them that humble themselves; God has set it, and it is the due time for the purpose, the time when it does best, even as sowing in the spring, and reaping in the harvest. When that time comes, your exalting shall no longer be put off, and it would come too soon should it come before that time.

Doct. I.—The bent of one's heart, in humbling circumstances, should lie towards a suitable humbling of the spirit, as under God's mighty hand placing us in them.

We have here,

I. Some things supposed in this. It supposeth and bears in it, that,

1. God brings men into humbling circumstances, Ezek. xvii. 24, "And all the trees of the field shall know, that I the Lord have brought down the high tree." There is a root of pride in the hearts of all men on earth, that must be mortified ere they can be meet for heaven: and, therefore, no man can miss, in this time of trial, some things that will give a proof whether he can stoop or no. And God brings them into humbling circumstances for that very end, Deut. viii. 2, "The Lord thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee, and to prove thee, and to know what was in thine heart."

2. These circumstances prove pressing as a weight on the heart, tending to bear it down, Psalm cvii. 12, "Therefore he brought down their hearts with labour." They strike at the grain of the heart, and cross the natural inclination: whence a trial naturally ariseth, whether, when God lays on his mighty hand, the man can yield under it or not; and consequently, whether he is meet for heaven or not.

3. The heart is naturally apt to rise up against these humbling circumstances, and consequently, against the mighty hand that

brings and keeps them on. The man naturally bends his force to get off the weight, that he may get up his head, seeking more to please himself than to please his God, Job, xxxv. 9, 10, "They cry out by reason of the arm of the mighty: but none saith, Where is God my Maker?" This is the first gate the heart runs to in humbling circumstances; and in this way the unsubdued spirit holds on.

4. But what God requires is, rather to labour to bring down the heart, than to get up the head, James, iv. 10. Here lies the proof of one's meetness for heaven; and then is one in the way heavenward, when he is more concerned to get down his heart than up his head, to go calmly under his burden than to get it off, to crouch under the mighty hand than to put it off him.

5. There must be a noticing of God as our party, in humbling circumstances: "Hear ye the rod, and him who hath appointed it," Mic. vi. 9. There is an abjectness of spirit, whereby some give themselves up to the will of others, in the harshest treatment, merely to please them, without regard to the authority and command of God. This is real meanness of spirit, whereby one lies quietly to be trampled on by a fellow-worm, from its imaginary weight; and none so readily fall into it as the proud, at some times, to serve their own turn, Acts, xii. 22. These are men-pleasers, Eph. vi. 6, with Gal. i. 10.

II. What are these humbling circumstances the mighty hand of God brings them into? Supposing here what was before taught concerning the crook in the lot's being of God's making, these are circumstances,

1. Of *imperfection.* God has placed all men in such circumstances under a variety of wants and imperfections, Phil. iii. 12. We can look no where, where we are not beset with them. There is a heap of natural and moral imperfections about us; our bodies and our souls, in all their faculties, are in a state of imperfection. The pride of all glory is stained; and it is a shame for us not to be humbled under such wants as attend us; it is like a beggar strutting in his rags.

2. Of *inferiority* in relations, whereby men are set in the lower place in relations and society, and made to depend on others, 1 Cor. vii. 24. God has, for a trial of men's submission to himself, subjected them to others whom he has set over them, to discover what regard they will pay to his authority and commands at second hand. Dominion or superiority is a part of the divine image shining in them, 1 Cor. xi. 7. And therefore reverence of them, consisting in an awful regard to that ray of the divine image shining in them, is necessarily required, Eph. v. 23; Heb. xii. 9, compare Psalm cxi. 9. The same holds in all other relations and superiorities, namely, that they are so far in the place of God to their relatives, Psalm lxxx. 6. And though the parties be worthless in themselves, that looseth not from the debt to them, Acts, xxiii. 4, 5; Rom. xiii. 7; the reason is, because it is not their qualities, but their character, which is the ground of that debt of reverence and subjection; and the trial God takes of us in that matter turns not on the point of the former, but of the latter.

Now, God having placed us in these circumstances of inferiority, all refractoriness in all things not contrary to the command of God, is a rising up against his mighty hand, Rom. xiii. 2, because it is immediately upon us for that effect, though it is a man's hand that is immediately on us.

3. Of *contradiction,* tending directly to bilk us of our will. This was a part of our Lord's state of humiliation, and the apostle supposes it will be a part of ours too, Heb. xii. 3. There is a perfect harmony in heaven, no one to contradict another there; for they are in their state of retribution and exaltation; but we are here in our state of trial and humiliation, and therefore cannot miss contradiction, be we placed ever so high.

Whether these contradictions be just or unjust, God tries men with them to humble them, to break them off from addictedness to their own will, and to teach them resignation and self-denial. They are in their own nature humbling, and much the same to us as the breaking of a horse or a bullock is to them. And I believe there are many cases in which there can be no accounting for them, but by recurring to this use God has for them.

4. Of *affliction,* Prov. xvi. 19, "Prosperity puffs up sinners with pride;" and oh, but it is hard to keep a low spirit with a high and prosperous lot. But God, by affliction, calls men down from their heights to sit in the dust, plucks away their gay feathers wherein they prided themselves, rubs the paint and varnish from off the creature, whereby it appears more in its native deformity. There are various kinds of affliction, some more, some less humbling, but all of them are humbling.

Wherefore, not to lower the spirit under the affliction, is to pretend to rise up when God is casting and holding down with a witness; and cannot miss, if continued in, to provoke the Lord to break us in pieces, Ezek. xxiv. 13. For the afflicting hand is mighty.

5. Of *sin,* as the punishment of sin. We may allude to that, Job, xxx. 19. All the sin in the world is a punishment of Adam's first sin. Man threw himself into the mire at first, and now he is justly left weltering in it. Men wilfully make one false step, and for that cause they are justly left to make another worse; and sin hangs about all, even the best.

And this is overruled of God for our humiliation, that we may be ashamed, and never open our mouth any more. Wherefore not to be humbled under our sinfulness is to rise up against the mighty hand of God, and to justify all our sinful departings from him, as lost to all sense of duty, and void of shame.

III. What it is, in humbling circumstances, to humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God. This is the great thing to be aimed at in our humbling circumstances. And we may take it up in these eight things.

1. Noticing the mighty hand, as employed in bringing about every thing that concerns us, either in the way of efficacy or permission, 1 Sam. iii. 18, "And he said, It is the Lord; let him do what seemeth him good." 2 Sam. xvi. 10, "And the king said, The Lord hath said unto him, Curse David; who shall then say, Wherefore hast thou done so?" He is the fountain of all perfection, but we must trace our imperfections to his sovereign will. It is he that has posted every one in their relations by his providence; without him we could not meet with such contradictions; for, "The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he pleaseth," Prov. xxi. 1. He sends afflictions, and he justly punishes one sin with another, Isaiah, vi. 10.

2. A sense of our own worthlessness and nothingness before him, Psalm cxliv. 3. Looking to the infinite majesty of the mighty hand dealing with us, we should say, with Abraham, Gen. xviii. 27, "Behold, I am but dust and ashes;" and say Amen to the cry, Isaiah, xl. 6, "All flesh is grass," &c. The keeping up of thoughts of our own excellency, under the pressure of the mighty hand, is the very thing that swells the heart in pride, causing it to rise up against it. And it is the letting of all such thoughts of ourselves fall before the eyes of his glory, that is the humbling required.

3. A sense of our guilt and filthiness, Rom. iii. 10; Isaiah, xliv. 6. The mighty hand doth not press us down, but as sinners. It is meet, then, that, under it, we see our sinfulness—our guilt, whereby we will appear criminals justly caused to suffer—our filthiness, whereupon we may be brought to loath ourselves; and then we shall think nothing lays us lower than we well deserve. It is the overlooking our sinfulness that suffers the proud heart to swell.

4. A silent submission under the hand of God. His sovereignty challengeth this of us. Rom. ix. 20, "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" And nothing but unsubdued height and pride of spirit can allow us to answer again under the sovereign hand. A view of the sovereign hand humbled and awed the Psalmist into a submission, with a profound silence. Psalm xxxix. 9, "I was dumb, I opened not my mouth, because thou didst it." Job, i. 21, "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord;" and xl. 4, 5, "What shall I answer thee? I will lay mine hand upon my mouth. Once have I spoken, but I will not answer; yea, twice, but I will proceed no farther." And Eli, 1 Sam. iii. 18, "It is the Lord; let him do what seemeth him good."

5. A magnifying of his mercies towards us in the midst of all his proceedings against us, Psalm cxliv. 3. Has he laid us low? If we be duly humbled, we shall wonder he has laid us no lower, Ezra, ix. 13. For, however low the humble are laid, they will see they are not yet so low as their sins deserve, Lam. iii. 22.

6. A holy and silent admiration of the ways and counsels of God, as to us unsearchable, Rom. xi. 33. Pride of heart thinks nothing too high for the man, and so arraigns before its tribunal the divine proceedings, pretends to see through them, censures freely and condemns; but humiliation of spirit disposes a man to think awfully and honourably of the mysteries of Providence he is not able to see through.

7. A forgetting and laying aside before the Lord all our dignity, whereby we excel others, Rev. iv. 10. Pride feeds itself on the man's real or imaginary personal excellency and dignity, and, being so inured to it before others, cannot forget it before God. Luke, xviii. 11, "God, I thank thee I am not as other men." But humiliation of spirit makes it all to vanish before him as doth the shadow before the shining sun, and it lays the man, in his own eyes, lower than any. "Surely I am more brutish than any man, and have not the understanding of a man," Prov. xxx. 2.

8. A submitting readily to the meanest offices requisite in, or agreeable to, our circumstances. Pride, at every turn, finds something that is below the man to condescend or stoop to, measuring by his own mind and will, not by the circumstances God has placed him in. But humility measures by the circumstances one is placed in, and readily falls in with what they require. Hereof our Saviour gave us an example to be imitated. John, xiii. 14, "If I, then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet." Yea more, Phil. ii. 8, "He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death."

Use. Of exhortation. Let the bent of your heart, then, in all your humbling circumstances, be towards the humbling of your spirit, as under the mighty hand of God. This lies in two things.

1. Carefully notice all your humbling circumstances, and overlook none of them. Observe your imperfections, inferiority in relations,

contradictions you meet with, your afflictions, uncertainty of all things about you, and your sinfulness. Look through them designedly, and consider the steps of the conduct of Providence towards you in these, that ye may know yourselves, and may not be strangers at home, blind to your own real state and case.

2. Observing what these circumstances do require of you, as suitable to them ; bend your endeavours towards it, to bring your spirits into the temper of humiliation, that, as your lot is really low in all these respects, so your spirits may be low too, as under the mighty hand of God. Let this be your great aim through your whole life, and your exercises every day.

Motive 1. God is certainly at work to humble one and all of us. However high any are lifted up in this world, Providence has hung certain badges for humiliation on them, whether they will notice them or not, Isaiah, xl. 6. Now, it is our duty to fall in with the design of Providence, that while God is humbling us, we may be humbling ourselves, and that we may not receive humbling dispensations in vain.

2. The humiliation of our spirit will not take effect without our own agency therein ; while God is working on us that way, we must work together with him, for he works on us as rational agents, who being moved, move themselves, Phil. ii. 12, 13. God, by his providence, may force down our lot and condition without us, but the spirit must come down voluntarily and of choice, or not at all : therefore, strike in with humbling providences in humbling yourselves, as mariners spread out the sails when the wind begins to blow, that they may go away before it.

3. If ye do not, ye resist the mighty hand of God, Acts, vii. 51. Ye resist in so far as ye do not yield, but stand as a rock keeping your ground against your Maker in humbling providences, Jer. v. 3, " Thou hast stricken them, but they have not grieved ; thou hast consumed them, but they have refused to receive correction. They have made their faces harder than a rock ; they have refused to return." Much more when ye work against him to force up your condition, which we may see God means to hold down. And of this resistance consider,

(1.) The *sinfulness ;* what an evil thing it is. It is a direct fighting against God, a shaking off of subjection to our sovereign Lord, and a rising in rebellion against him,Isa.xlv.9.

(2.) The *folly* of it. How unequal is the match ! How can the struggle end well ? Job, ix. 4. What else can possibly be the issue of the potsherds of the earth dashing against the Rock of Ages, but that they be broken to pieces ? We may say as Job, xli. 8. All men must certainly bow or break under the mighty hand.

4. This is the time of humiliation, even the time of this life. Every thing is beautiful in its season ; and the bringing down of the spirit now is beautiful, as in the time thereof, even as the ploughing and sowing of the ground is in the spring. Consider,

(1.) Humiliation of spirit " is in the sight of God of great price," 1 Pet. iii. 4. As he has a special aversion to pride of heart, he has a special liking of humility, chap. v. 5. The humbling of sinners and bringing them down from their heights, wherein the corruption of their nature has set them, is the great end of his word, and of his providences.

(2.) It is no easy thing to humble men's spirits ; it is not a little that will do it ; it is a work that is not soon done. There is need of a digging deep for a thorough humiliation in the work of conversion, Luke, vi. 48. Many a stroke must be given at the root of the tree of the natural pride of the heart ere it fall ; ofttimes it seems to be fallen, and yet it arises again. And, even when the root stroke is given in believers, the rod of pride buds again, so that there is still occasion for new humbling work.

(3.) The whole time of this life is appointed for humiliation. This was signified by the forty years the Israelites had in the wilderness, Deut. viii. 2. It was so to Christ, and therefore it must be so to men, Heb. xii. 2. And in that time they must either be formed according to his image, or else appear as reprobate silver that will not take it on by any means, Rom. viii. 29. So that whatever lifting up men may now and then get in this life, the habitual course of it will still be humbling.

(4.) There is no humbling after this, Rev. xxii. 11. If the pride of the heart be not brought down in this life, it will never be ; no kindly humiliation is to be expected in the other life. There the proud will be broken in pieces, but not softened ; their lot and condition will be brought to the lowest pass, but the loftiness of their spirits will still remain, whence they will be in eternal agonies through the opposition betwixt their spirits and lot, Rev. xvi. 21.

Wherefore, beware lest ye neglect your time of humiliation ; humbled we must be, or we are gone for ever ; and this is the time, the only time of it ; therefore, make your hay while the sun shines ; strike in with humbling providences, and fight not against them while ye have them, Acts, xiii. 41. The season of grace will not last ; if ye sleep in seed-time, ye will beg in harvest.

5. This is the way to turn humbling circumstances to a good account ; so that, instead of being losers, ye may be gainers by them, Psal. cxix. 71. " It is good for me that I have been afflicted." Would ye gather grapes of these thorns and thistles, set yourselves to get your spirits humbled by them.

(1.) Humiliation of spirit is a most valuable thing in itself, Prov. xvi. 32. It cannot be bought too dear. Whatever one is made to suffer, if his spirit is thereby duly brought down, he has what is well worth bearing all the hardship for, 1 Pet. iii. 4.

(2.) Humility of spirit brings many advantages along with it. It is a fruitful bough, well loaden, whatever it is. It contributes to one's ease under the cross, Matt. xi. 30; Lam. iii. 27—29. It is a sacrifice particularly acceptable to God, Psalm li. 17. The eye of God is particularly on such for good, Isa. lxvi. 2, "To this man will I look, even to him that is poor, and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word." Yea, he dwells with them, Isa. lvii. 15. And it carries a line of wisdom through one's whole conduct, Prov. xi. 2, "With the lowly is wisdom."

Lastly, Consider it is a mighty hand that is at work with us—the hand of the mighty God: let us then bend our spirits towards a compliance with it, and not wrestle against it. Consider,

(1.) We must fall under it. Since the design of it is to bring us down, we cannot stand before it; for it cannot miscarry in its designs, Isa. xlvi. 10, "My counsel shall stand." So fall before it we must, either in the way of duty or judgment: Psal. xlv. 5, "Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the king's enemies, whereby the people fall under thee."

(2.) They that are so wise as to fall in humiliation under the mighty hand, be they ever so low, the same hand will raise them up again, James, iv. 10. In a word, be the proud ever so high, God will bring them down: be the humble ever so low, God will raise them up.

Directions for reaching this Humiliation.

I. General Directions.—1. Fix it in your heart to seek some spiritual improvement of the conduct of Providence towards you, Micah, vi. 9. Till once your heart is bent that way, your humiliation is not to be expected, Hosea, xiv. 9. But nothing is more reasonable, if we would act either like men or Christians, than to aim at turning what is so grievous to the flesh unto the profit of the spirit; that, if we are losers on one hand, we may be gainers on the other.

2. Settle the matter of your eternal salvation, in the first place, by betaking yourself to Christ, and taking God for your God in him, according to the gospel offer, Hosea, ii. 19; Heb. viii. 10. Let your humbling circumstances move you to this, that while the creature dries up, you may go to the fountain; for it is impossible to reach due humiliation under the mighty hand, without faith in him as your God and Friend, Heb. xi. 6; 1 John, iv. 19.

3. Use the means of soul-humbling in the faith of the promise, Psal. xxviii. 7. Moses smiting the rock in faith of the promise, made water gush out, which otherwise would not at all have appeared. Let us do likewise in dealing with our rocky hearts. They must be laid on the soft bed of the gospel, and struck there, as Joel, ii. 13, "Turn to the Lord your God, for he is gracious and merciful:" or they will never kindly break or fall in humiliation.

II. Particular Directions.—1. Assure yourselves that there are no circumstances so humbling that you are in, but you may get your heart acceptably brought down to them, 1 Cor. x. 13, "But God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able, but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." This is the truth, 2 Cor. xii. 9, "My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness." And you should be persuaded of it, with application to yourselves, if ever you would reach the end, Phil. iv. 13, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." God allows you to be persuaded of it, whatever is your weakness and the difficulty of the task. "For your sakes this is written, that he that plougheth should plough in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope, should be partaker of his hope," 1 Cor. ix. 10. And the belief thereof is a piece of the life of faith, 2 Tim. ii. 1. If you have no hope of success, your endeavours, as they will be heartless, so they will be vain. "Wherefore lift up the hands that hang down, and the feeble knees," Heb. xii. 12.

2. Whatever hand is, or is not, in your humbling circumstances, do you take God for your party, and consider yourselves therein as under his mighty hand, Mic. vi. 9. Men in their humbling circumstances overlook God; so they find not themselves called to humility under them; they fix their eyes on the creature instrument, and, instead of humility, their hearts rise. But take him for your party, that ye may remember the battle, and do no more, Job, xli. 8.

3. Be much in the thoughts of God's infinite greatness; consider his holiness and majesty, fit to awe you into the deepest humiliation, Isa. vi. 3—5. Job met with many humbling providences in his case, but he was never sufficiently humbled under them; till the Lord made a new discovery of himself unto him, in his infinite majesty and greatness. He kept his ground against his friends, and stood to his points, till the Lord took that method with him. It was begun with thunder, Job, xxxvii. 1, 2. Then followed God's voice out of the whirlwind, chap. xxxviii. 1, whereon Job is brought down, chap. xl. 4, 5. It is renewed till he is farther humbled, chap.

xlii. 5, 6, "Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes."

4. Inure yourselves silently to admit mysteries in the conduct of Providence towards you, which you are not able to comprehend, but will adore, Rom. xi. 33, "Oh, the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" That was the first word God said to Job, xxxviii. 2, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" It took him by the heart, stuck with him, and he comes over it again, chap. xlii. 3, as that which particularly brought him to his knees, to the dust. Even in those steps of Providence, which we seem to see far into, we may well allow there are some mysteries beyond what we see. And in those which are perplexing and puzzling, sovereignty should silence us; his infinite wisdom should satisfy, though we cannot see.

5. Be much in the thoughts of your own sinfulness, Job, xl. 4, "Behold I am vile, what shall I answer thee? I will lay mine hand upon my mouth." It is overlooking of that which gives us so much ado with humbling circumstances. While the eyes are held that they cannot see sin, the heart riseth against them; but when they are opened, it falls. Wherefore, whenever God is dealing with you in humbling dispensations, turn your eyes, upon that occasion, on the sinfulness of your nature, heart, and life, and that will help forward your humiliation.

6. Settle it in your heart, that there is need of all the humbling circumstances you are put in. This is the truth, 1 Pet. i. 6; "Though now for a season (if need be) ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations." God brings no needless trials upon us, afflicts none but as their need requires, Lam. iii. 33, "For he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." That is an observable difference betwixt our earthly and our heavenly Father's correction, Heb. xii. 10, "They, after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness." Look to the temper of your own hearts and nature, how apt to be lift up, forget God, carried away with the vanities of the world; what foolishness is bound up in your heart. Thus you will see the need of humbling circumstances for ballast, and of the rod for the fool's back; and if at any time you cannot see that need, believe it on the ground of God's infinite wisdom, that does nothing in vain.

7. Believe a kind design of Providence in them towards you. God calls to this, as the key that opens the heart under them, Rev. iii. 19. Satan suggests suspicions to the contrary, as the bar which may hold it shut, 2 Kings, vi. 33, "This evil is of the Lord; what should I wait for the Lord any longer?" As long as the suspicions of an ill design in them against us reigns, the creature will, like the worm at the man's feet, put itself in the best posture of defence it can, and harden itself in sorrow: but the faith of a kind design will cause it to open out itself in humility before him.

Case. "Oh! if I knew there were a kind design in it, I would willingly bear it, although there were more of it; but I fear a ruining design of Providence against me therein."

Ans. Now, what word of God, or discovery from heaven, have you to ground these fears upon? None at all, 1 Cor. x. 13. What think you the design towards you in the gospel is? Can you believe no kind design towards you in all the words of grace there heaped up neither! What is that, I pray, but black unbelief, flying in the face of the truth of God, and making him a liar, Isa. lv. 1; 1 John, v. 10, 11. The gospel is a breathing of love and good-will to the world of mankind, even to sinners of every description, John, iii. 17; Tit. ii. 11; iii. 4; 1 John, iv. 13. But you believe it not, in that case, more than devils believe it. But if you believe a kind design there, you must believe it in your humbling circumstances too; for the design of Providence cannot be contrary to the design of the gospel; but contrariwise the one is to help forward the other.

8. Think with yourselves, that this life is the time of trial for heaven, James, i. 12, "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation; for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him." And therefore there should be a welcoming of humbling circumstances in that view, ver. 2, "Count it all joy when you fall into divers temptations." If there is an honourable office, or beneficial employment to be bestowed, men strive to be taken on trial for it, in hope they may be thereupon legally admitted to it. Now, God takes trial of men for heaven by humbling circumstances, as the whole Bible teacheth; and shall men be so very loath to stoop to them? I would ask,

(1.) Is it nothing to you to stand a candidate for glory, to be put on trials for heaven? Is there not an honour in it, an honour which all the saints have had? James, v. 11, "Behold we count them happy that endure." And a fair prospect in it, 2 Cor. iv. 17, "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." Do but put the case, Should God overlook you as one whom it is needless ever to try on that head—should he order your portion in this life with full ease, as one that is to get no more of him,—what would that be?

(2.) What a vast disproportion is there

between your trials and the future glory! Your most humbling circumstances, how light are they in comparison of the weight of it! The longest continuance of them is but for a moment, compared with that eternal weight. Alas! there is much unbelief at the root of all our uneasiness under our humbling circumstances. Had we a clearer view of the other world, we should not make so much of either the smiles or frowns of this.

(3.) What think ye of coming foul off in the trial of your humbling circumstances? Jer. vi. 29, 30, "The lead is consumed of the fire; the founder melteth in vain; for the wicked are not plucked away. Reprobate silver shall men call them, because the Lord hath rejected them." That the issue of it be only, that your heart appear of such a temper as by no means to be humbled; and that therefore you must and shall be taken off them, while yet no humbling appears. I think the awfulness of the dispensation is such, as might set us to our knees to deprecate the lifting us up from our humbling circumstances, ere our hearts are humbled, Isa. i. 5; Ezek. xxiv. 13.

9. Think with yourselves, how it is by humbling circumstances the Lord prepares us for heaven, Col. i. 12, "Giving thanks unto the Father, who hath made us meet to be made partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light," 2 Cor. v. 5. The stones and timber are laid down, turned over and over, and hewed, ere they be set up in the building; and not set up just as they come out of the quarry and wood. Were they capable of a choice, such of them as would refuse the iron tool would be refused a place in the building. Pray, how think ye to be made meet for heaven, by the warm sunshine of this world's ease, and getting all your will here? Nay, sirs, that would put your mouth out of taste for the joys of the other world. Vessels of dishonour are fitted for destruction that way; but vessels of honour for glory by humbling circumstances. I would here say,—

1*st*, Will nothing please you but two heavens,—one here, another hereafter? God has secured one heaven for the saints, one place where they shall get all their will, wish, and desire—where there shall be no weight on them to hold them down; and that is in the other world. But you must have it both here and there, or you cannot digest it. Why do you not quarrel, too, that there are not two summers in one year—two days in twenty-four hours? The order of the one heaven is as firm as that of the years and days, and you cannot reverse it: therefore, choose you whether you will take your night or your day first, your winter or your summer, your heaven here or hereafter.

2*d*, Without being humbled with humbling circumstances in this life, you are not capable of heaven, 2 Cor. v. 5, "Now, he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God." You may, indeed, lie at ease here in a bed of sloth, and dream of heaven, big with hopes of a fool's paradise, wishing to cast yourselves just out of Delilah's lap into Abraham's bosom; but without you be humbled, you are not capable,—

(1.) Of the Bible heaven, that heaven described in the Old and New Testaments. Is not that heaven a lifting up in due time? But how shall you be lifted up that are never well got down? Where will your tears be to be wiped away? What place will there be for your triumph, that will not fight the good fight? How can it be a rest to you, who cannot away with labour?

(2.) Of the saints' heaven, Rev. vii. 14, "And he said unto me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." This answers the question touching Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the saints with them there: they were brought down to the dust with humbling circumstances, and out of these they came before the throne. How can you ever think to be lifted up with them, with whom you cannot think to be brought down?

(3.) Of Christ's heaven, Heb. xii. 2, "Who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is now set down at the right hand of God." Oh, consider how the forerunner made his way, Luke, xxiv. 26, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" And lay your account with it, that if you get where he is, you must go thither as he went, Luke, ix. 23, "And he said, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me."

10. Give up at length with your towering hopes from this world, and confine them to the world to come. Be as pilgrims and strangers here, looking for your rest in heaven, and not till you come there. There is a prevailing evil, Isa. lvii. 10, "Thou art wearied in the greatness of thy way: yet saidst thou not, There is no hope." So the Babel building is still continued, though it has fallen down again and again: for men say, "The bricks are fallen down, but we will build with hewn stones; the sycamores are cut down, but we will change them into cedars," Isa. ix. 10. This makes humbling work very tedious; we are so hard to quit hold of the creature, to fall off from the breast and be weaned. But fasten your grasp on the other world, and let this go; so shall you be humbled, indeed, under the mighty hand. The faster you hold the happiness of that world, the easier will it be to accommodate yourselves to your humbling circumstances here.

11. Make use of Christ in all his offices, for your humiliation under your humbling circumstances. That only is kindly humiliation that comes in that way, Zech. xii. 10, "And they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn," &c. This you must do by trusting on him for that effect, —

(1.) As a priest for you. You have a conscience full of guilt, and that will make one uneasy in any circumstances, and far more in humbling circumstances; it will be like a thorn in the shoulder, on which a burden is laid. But the blood of Christ will purge the conscience, draw out the thorn, give ease, Isa. xxxiii. 24, and fit for service doing or suffering: Heb. ix. 14, "How much more shall the blood of Christ purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

(2.) As your prophet, to teach you. We have need to be taught rightly to discern our humbling circumstances; for, often we mistake them so far, that they prove an oppressive load; whereas, could we rightly see them, just as God sets them to us, they would be humbling, but not so oppressive. Truly we need Christ, and the light of his word and Spirit, to let us see our cross and trial as well as our duty, Psal. xxv. 9, 10.

(3.) As your king. You have a stiff heart, loath to bow even in humbling circumstances: take a lesson from Moses what to do in such a case, Exod. xxxiv. 9, "And he said, Let my Lord, I pray thee, go amongst us, (for it is a stiff-necked people,) and pardon our iniquity and our sin." Put it in his hand that is strong and mighty, Psal. xxiv. 8. He is able to cause it to melt, and, like wax before the fire, turn to the seal.

Think on these directions, in order to put them in practice, remembering, that if ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them. Remember humbling work is a work that will fill your hand, while you live here, and that you cannot come to the end of it till death; and humbling circumstances will attend you, while you are in this lower world. A change of them you may get; but a freedom from them you cannot, till you come to heaven. So the humbling circumstances of our imperfections, relations, contradictions, afflictions, uncertainties, and sinfulness, will afford matter of exercise to us while here. What remains of the purpose of this text, I shall comprise in,

Doct. II. There is a due time, wherein those that now humble themselves under the mighty hand of God will certainly be lifted up. We shall,

I. Take a general view of this point. And, 1*st*, Consider some things supposed and implied in it. It bears,

1. That those who shall share of this lifting up, must lay their account, in the first place, with a casting down, Rev. vii. 14; John, xvi. 33, "In the world ye shall have tribulation." There is no coming to the promised land, according to the settled method of grace, but through the wilderness; nor entering into this exaltation, but through a strait gate. If we cannot away with the casting down, we shall not taste the sweet of the lifting up.

2. Being cast down by the mighty hand of God, we must learn to lie still and quiet under it, till the same hand that cast us down raise us up, if we would share of this promised lifting up, Lam. iii. 27. It is not the being cast down into humbling circumstances, by the providence of God, that brings us within the compass of this promise.

3. Never humbled in humbling circumstances, never lifted up in the way of this promise. Men may keep their spirits on the high bend in their humbling circumstances, and in that case may obtain a lifting up, Prov. xvi. 19. But note this, what they gain will be a lifting up, to the end they may have the more grievous fall. "Surely thou didst set them in slippery places; thou castest them down in a moment," Psalm lxxiii. 18. But they who will not humble themselves in humbling circumstances, will find their obstinacy as a nail, that will keep their misery ever fast on them without remedy.

4. Humility of spirit, in humbling circumstances, ascertains a lifting up out of them some time, with the good will and favour of Heaven, Luke, xviii. 14, "I tell you this man went down to his house justified rather than the other; for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." Solomon observes, Prov. xv. 1, that "a soft answer turneth away wrath; but grievous words stir up anger." And so it is, that while the proud, through their obstinacy, do but wreath the yoke faster about their own necks, the yielding humbling ones, by their yielding make their relief sure, 1 Sam. ii. 8—10, "He raiseth the poor out of the dust, and lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill, to set them among princes, and to make them inherit the throne of glory. He will keep the feet of his saints, and the wicked shall be silent in darkness; for by strength shall no man prevail. The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken in pieces." So the cannon ball breaks down a stone wall, while the yielding packs of wool take away its force.

5. There is an appointed time for the lifting up of those that humble themselves in their humbling circumstances, Hab. ii. 3, "For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry." To every thing there is a time, as for humbling, so for lifting up, Eccles. iii. 3.

We know it not, but God knows it, who hath appointed it. Let not the humble one say, I will never be lifted up; there is a time fixed for it, as precisely as for the rising of the sun after the long and dark night, or the return of the spring after the long and sharp winter.

6. It is not to be expected, that, immediately upon one's humbling himself, the lifting up is to follow. No; one is not to lie down under the mighty hand, but lie still, waiting the due time. Humbling work is tedious work; the Israelites had forty years of it in the wilderness. God's people must be brought to put a blank in his hand, as to the time; and while they have a long night of walking in darkness, must trust, Isaiah, l. 10, "Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of his servant, that walketh in darkness and hath no light? Let him trust in the name of the Lord, and stay upon his God."

7. The appointed time for the lifting up is the due time, the time fittest for it, wherein it will come most seasonably. "And let us not be weary in well-doing; for, in due season we shall reap, if we faint not," Gal. vi. 9. For that is the time God has chosen for it; and be sure his choice, as the choice of infinite wisdom, is the best; and therefore faith sets to wait it; Isa. xxviii. 16, "He that believeth shall not make haste." There is much of the beauty of a thing depends on the timing of it, and he has fixed that in all that he does, Eccl. iii. 11, "He hath made every thing beautiful in his time."

8. The lifting up of the humble will not fail to come in the appointed and due time, Hab. ii. 3. Time makes no halting; it is running day and night: so the due time is fast coming, and, when it comes, it will bring the lifting up along with it. Let the humbling circumstances be ever so low, ever so hopeless, it is impossible but the lifting up from them must come in due time.

2*dly*, A word, in the general, to the lifting up, abiding those that humble themselves. There is a two-fold lifting up.

1. A partial lifting up, competent to the humbled in time, during this life, Psalm xxx. 1, "I will extol thee, O Lord, for thou hast lifted me up, and hast not made my foes to rejoice over me." This is a lifting up in part, and but in part, not wholly: and such liftings up the humble may expect, while in this world, but no more. These give a breathing to the weary, a change of burdens, but do not set them at perfect ease. So Israel, in the wilderness, in the midst of their many mourning times, had some singing ones, Exod. xv. 1; Numbers xxi. 17.

2. A total lifting up, competent to them at the end of time, at death, Luke, xvi. 22, "It came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried, by angels, into Abraham's bosom." Then the Lord deals with them no more by parcels and halves, but carries their relief to perfection, Heb. xii. 23. Then he takes off all their burdens, eases them of all their weights, and lays no more on for ever. He then lifts them up to a height they were never at before; no, not even at their highest. He sets them quite above all that is low, and therein fixes them, never to be brought down more. Now, there is a due time for both these.

(1.) For the partial lifting up. Every time is not fit for it; we are not always fit to receive comfort, an ease or a change of our burdens. God sees there are times wherein it is needful for his people to be in heaviness, 1 Pet. i. 6, to have their hearts brought down with grief, Psalm cvii. 12. But then there is a time really appointed for it in the divine wisdom, when he will think it as needful to comfort them, as before to bring down, 2 Cor. ii. 7, "So that, contrariwise, ye ought rather to forgive, and comfort him, lest, perhaps, such an one should be swallowed up with over much sorrow." We are, in that case, in the hand of God, as in the hand of our physician, who appoints the time the drawing plaster shall be applied, and leaves it not to the patient.

(2.) For the total lifting up. When we are sore oppressed with our burdens, we are ready to think, Oh, to be away, and set beyond them all. Job, vii. 2, 3, "As a servant earnestly desireth the shadow, and as a hireling looketh for the reward of his work; so am I made to possess months of vanity, and wearisome nights are appointed me." But it may be fitter, for all that, that we may stay a while, and wrestle with our burdens. Phil. i. 24, 25, "Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you. And having that confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all, for your furtherance and joy of faith." A few days might have taken Israel out of Egypt into Canaan; but they would have been over soon there, if they had made all that speed; so they behoved to spend forty years in the wilderness, till their due time of entering Canaan should come. And be sure the saints entering heaven will be convinced that the time of it is best chosen, and there will be a beauty in that it was not sooner. And thus a lifting up is secured for the humble.

3*dly*, The certainty of the lifting up of those that humble themselves under the humbling circumstances. If one would assure you, when reduced to poverty, that the time should certainly yet come that ye should be rich—when sore sick, that ye should not die of that disease, but certainly recover,—that would help you to bear your poverty and sickness the better, and you would comfort yourselves with that prospect. However, one may continue poor, and never be rich, may be sick, and die of his disease; but whoever humble themselves under their humbling circumstances, we can assure them from the Lord's word, they shall certainly, without all peradventure, be lifted up out of, and relieved from, their humbling circumstances; they shall certainly see the day of their ease and relief, when they shall remember their burdens as waters that fail. And ye may be assured thereof from the following considerations:

1. The nature of God, duly considered, ensures it. Psalm ciii. 8, 9, "The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide; neither will he keep his anger for ever." The humbled soul, looking to God in Christ, may see three things in his nature jointly securing it.

(1.) Infinite power, that can do all things. No circumstances are so low, but he can raise them; so entangling and perplexing, but he can unravel them; so hopless, but he can remedy them. Gen. xviii. 14, "Is any thing too hard for the Lord?" Be our case what it will, it is never past reach with him to help it; but then it is the most proper season for him to take in hand, when all others have given it over. Deut. xxxii. 36, "For the Lord shall judge his people, and repent himself for his servants; when he seeth that their power is gone, and there is none shut up, or left."

(2.) Infinite goodness inclining to help. He is good and gracious in his nature, Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7. And therefore his power is a spring of comfort to them, Rom. xiv. 4. Men may be willing that are not able, or able that are not willing; but infinite goodness, joining infinite power in God, may ascertain the humbled of a lifting up in due time. That is a word of inconceivable sweetness, 1 John, iv. 16, "And we know and believe the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him." He has the bowels of a father towards the humble. Psalm ciii. 13, "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." Yes, bowels of mercy more tender than a mother to her sucking child, Isaiah, xlix. 15. Wherefore, howbeit his wisdom may see it necessary to put them in humbling circumstances, and keep them in them for a time, it is not possible he can leave them in them for altogether.

(3.) Infinite wisdom, that doth nothing in vain, and therefore will not needlessly keep one in humbling circumstances, Lam. iii. 32, 33, "But though he cause grief, yet he will have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies; for he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." God sends them afflictions for humbling, as the end and design to be brought about by them; when that is obtained, and there is no more use for them that way, we may assure ourselves they will be taken off.

2. The providence of God, viewed in its stated method of procedure with its objects, ensures it. Turn your eyes which way you will on the divine Providence, you may conclude thence, that, in due time, the humble will be lifted up.

(1.) Observe the providence of God, in the revolutions of the whole course of nature, day succeeding to the longest night, a summer to the winter, a waxing to a waning of the moon, a flowing to an ebbing of the sea, &c. Let not the Lord's humbled ones be idle spectators of these things. They are for our learning, Jer. xxxi. 35, 36, 37. Will the Lord's hand keep such a steady course in the earth, sea, and visible heavens, as to bring a lifting up in them after a casting down, and only forget his humbled ones? No, by no means.

(2.) Observe the providence of God, in the dispensations thereof, about the man Christ, the most noble and august object thereof, more valuable than a thousand worlds, Col. ii. 9. Did not Providence keep this course with him, first humbling him, then exalting him, and lifting him up; first bringing him to the dust of death, in a course of sufferings thirty-three years, then exalt him to the Father's right hand in eternity of glory? Heb. xii. 2, "Who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is now set down at the right hand of the throne of God." Phil. ii. 8, 9, "And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; wherefore God hath also highly exalted him." The exaltation could not fail to follow his humiliation. Luke, xxiv. 26, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" And he saw and believed it would follow, as the springing of the seed doth the sowing it, John, xii. 24. There is a near concern the humbled in humbling circumstances have herein.

(1.) This is the pattern Providence copies after in its conduct towards you. The Father was so well pleased with this method, in the case of his own Son, that it was determined to be followed, and just copied over again in the case of all the heirs of glory, Rom. viii. 29, "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren." And who would not be pleased to walk through the dark valley treading his steps?

(2.) This is a sure pledge of your lifting up. Christ, in his state of humiliation, was considered as a public person and representative, and so is he in his exaltation. So Christ's exaltation ensures your exaltation out of your humbling circumstances. Isaiah, xxvi. 19, "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust." Hos. vi. 1, 2. "Come and let us return unto the Lord; for he hath torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up. After two days he will revive us; in the third day, he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight." Eph. ii. 6, "And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." Yes, he is gone into the state of glory for us as our forerunner. Heb. vi. 20, "Whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made a high priest for ever."

(3.) His humiliation was the price of your exaltation, and his exaltation a full testimony of the acceptance of its payment to the full. There are no humbling circumstances you are in, but you would have perished in them, had not he purchased your lifting up out of them by his own humiliation, Isaiah, xxvi. 19. Now, his humbling grace in you is an evidence of the acceptance of his humiliation for your lifting up.

(4.) Observe the providence of God towards the Church in all ages. This has been the course the Lord has kept with her, Psalm cxxix. 1—4. Abel was slain by the wicked Cain, to the great grief of Adam and Eve, and the rest of their pious children; but then there was another seed raised up in Abel's room after, Gen. iv. 25. Noah and his sons were buried alive in the ark more than a year; but then they were brought out into a new world and blessed. Abraham for many years went childless; but at length Isaac was born. Israel was long in miserable bondage in Egypt, but at length seated in the promised land, &c. We must be content to go by the footsteps of the flock; and if in humiliation, we shall surely follow them in exaltation too.

(5.) Observe the providence of God in the dispensation of his grace towards his children. The general rule is, 1 Pet. v. 5, "For God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble." How are they brought into a state of grace? Is it not by a sound work of humiliation going before? Luke, vi. 48. And ordinarily the greater measure of grace is designed for one, the deeper is their humiliation before, as in Paul's case. If they are to be recovered out of a backslidden case, the same method is followed; so that deepest humiliation ordinarily makes way for the greatest comforts, and the darkest hour goes before the rising of the Sun of Righteousness upon them, Isaiah, lxvi. 5—13.

(6.) Observe the providence of God at length throwing down wicked men, however long they stand and prosper. Psalm xxxvii. 35, 36, "I have seen the wicked in great power, and spreading himself like a green bay tree; yet he passed away, and lo he was not; yea, I sought him, but he could not be found." They are long green before the sun, but at length they are suddenly smitten with an east wind, and wither away; their lamp goes out, and they are thrust into obscure darkness. Now, it is inconsistent with the benignity of the divine nature, to forget the humble to raise them, while he minds the proud to abase them.

3. The word of God puts it beyond all peradventure, which, from the beginning to the end, is the humbled saint's security for lifting up, Psalm cxix. 49, 50, "Remember the word unto thy servant, upon which thou hast caused me to hope. This is my comfort in my affliction; for thy word hath quickened me." His word is the great letter of his name, which he will certainly cause to shine, Psalm cxxxviii. 2, "For thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name:" and in all generations has been safely trusted to, Psalm xii. 6. Consider,

(1.) The doctrines of the word, which teach faith and hope for the time, and the happy issue which the exercises of these graces will have. The whole current of Scripture, to those in humbling circumstances, is, "Not to cast away their confidence, but to hope to the end;" and that for this good reason, that "it shall not be in vain." See Psalm xxvii. 14, "Wait on the Lord; be of good courage, and he shall strengthen thine heart. Wait, I say, on the Lord." And compare Rom. ix. 33; Isaiah, xlix. 23, "For they shall not be ashamed that wait for me."

(2.) The promises of the word, whereby heaven is expressly engaged for a lifting up to those that humble themselves in humbling circumstances: James, iv. 10, "Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up." Matt. xxiii. 12, "And he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." It may take a time to prepare them for lifting up, but that being done, it is secured, Psalm x. 17, "Lord, thou hast heard the desire of the humble, thou wilt prepare their heart; thou wilt cause thine ear to hear." They have his word for deliverance, Psalm i. 15. And though they may seem to be forgotten, they shall not be always so; the time of their deliverance will come, Psalm ix. 18, "For the needy shall not always be forgotten: the expectation of the poor shall not perish for ever." Psalm cii. 17, "He will regard the prayer of the destitute, and not despise their prayer."

(3.) The examples of the word sufficiently confirming the truth of the doctrines and promises, Rom. xv. 4, "For whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning; that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." In the doctrines and promises, the lifting up is proposed to our faith, to be reckoned on the credit of God's word; but in the examples, it is, in the case of others, set before our eyes to be seen; James, v. 11, "Behold we count them happy which endure. Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy." There we see it in the case of Abraham, Job, David, Paul, and other saints: but above all, in the case of the man Christ.

(4.) The intercession of Christ, joining the prayers and cries of his humbled people, in their humbling circumstances, ensures a lifting up for them at length. Be it so, that the proud cry not when he bindeth them; yet his own humbled ones will do so, they will cry, Psalm xlii. 7, 8, "Deep calleth unto deep, at the noise of thy water-spouts; all thy waves and thy billows are gone over me. Yet the Lord will command his loving-kindness in the day-time, and in the night his song shall be with me, and my prayer unto the God of my life." Now, Christ's intercession being joined to these cries, there cannot miss to be a lifting up. Consider,

1. Christ's intercession is certainly joined with the cries and prayers of the humbled in their humbling circumstances. Rev. viii. 3, "And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne." They are by the Spirit helped to groan for relief, Rom. viii. 26.; and the prayers and groans which are through the Spirit, are certainly to be made effectual by the intercession of the Son, James, v. 16. And ye may know they are by the Spirit, if so be ye are helped to continue praying, hoping for your suit at last on the ground of God's word of promise; for nature's praying is a pool that will dry up in a long drought. It is the spirit of prayer that is the lasting spring, John, iv. 14; Psalm cxxxviii. 3, "In the day when I cried, thou answeredst me; and strengthenedst me with strength in my soul." Truly there is an intercession in heaven, on account of the humbling circumstances of the humble ones. "Then the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years?" Zech. i. 12. How then can they miss of a lifting up in due time?

2. He is in deepest earnest in his intercession for his people in their humbling circumstances. Some will speak a good word in favour of the helpless, that will be little concerned whether they succeed or not; but our Intercessor is in earnest in behalf of his humbled ones; for he is touched with sympathy in their case, Isaiah, lxiii. 9, "In all their afflictions he was afflicted." A most tender sympathy, Zech. ii. 8, "For he that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of his eye." He has their case upon his heart, where he is in the holy place, in the highest heavens, Exod. xxviii. 29, and he keeps an exact account of the time of their humbling circumstances, be it as long as it will, Zech. i. 12. Moreover, it is his own business; the lifting up which they are to have is a thing that is secured to him, in the promises made to him on the account of his blood shed for them, Psalm lxxxix. 33—36. So not only are they looking on earth, but the man Christ is in heaven looking for the accomplishment of these promises, Heb. x. 12, 13, "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." How is it possible, then, that that looking should be disappointed?

3. His intercession is always effectual. John, xi. 42, "And I know that thou hearest me always." It cannot miss to be so, because he is the Father's well-beloved Son; his intercession has a plea of justice for the ground of it, 1 John, ii. 1, "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous." Moreover, he has all power in heaven and earth lodged in him, 1 John, v. 22. And, finally, he and his Father are one, and their will one. So, for the present time, both Christ and his Father do will the lifting up of the humble ones, but yet only in due time.

II. I proceed to a more particular view of the point. And,

First, We will consider the lifting up as brought about in time, which is the partial lifting up. And,

1*st*, Some considerations for clearing the nature thereof.

1. This lifting up does not take place in every case of a child of God. One may be humbled in humbling circumstances, from which he is not to get a lifting up in time. We would not from the promise presently conclude, that we, being humbled under our humbling circumstances, shall certainly be taken out of them, and freed from them ere we get to the end of our journey. For it is certain there are some, such as our imperfections, and sinfulness, and mortality, we can by no means be rid of while in this world. And there are particular humbling circumstances the Lord may hang about one, and keep about him, till he goes down to the grave, while, in the mean time, he may lift up another from the same. Heman was pressed down all along from his youth, Psal. lxxxviii. 15, others all their lifetime, Heb. ii. 15.

Object. "If that be the case, what comes of the promise of lifting up? Where is the lifting up, if one may go to the grave under the weight?"

Ans. Were there no life after this, there would be weight in that objection; but since there is another life, there is none in it at all. In the other life the promise will be accomplished to the humbled, as it was, Luke, xvi. 22. Consider that the great term for accomplishing the promises, is the other life, not this. "These all died in the faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them," Heb. xi. 13. And that whatever accomplishment of the promise is here, it is not of the nature of the stock, but of a sample or a pledge.

Quest. "But then, may we not give over praying for the lifting up, in that case?"

Ans. We do not know when that is our case: for a case may be past all hope in our eyes, and the eyes of others, in which God designs a lifting up in time, as in Job, vi. 11, "What is my strength that I should hope? and what is mine end that I should prolong my life?" But, be it as it will, we should never give over praying for the lifting up, since it will certainly come to all that pray in faith for it; if not here, yet hereafter. The promise is sure, and that is the commandment; so such praying cannot miss of a happy issue at length, Psalm l. 15, "Call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." The whole life of a Christian is a praying, waiting life, to encourage whereunto all temporal deliverances are given as pledges, Rom. viii. 23, "And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit; even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, even the redemption of our body." And whoso observes that full lifting up at death to be at hand, must certainly rise, if he has given over his case as hopeless.

2. However, there are some cases wherein this lifting up does take place. God gives his people some notable liftings up, even in time raising them out of remarkable humbling circumstances. The storm is changed into a calm, and they remember it as waters that fail, Psalm xl. 1—4. Two things may be observed on this.

(1.) One may be in humbling circumstances very long, and sore, and hopeless, and yet a lifting up may be abiding them, of a much longer continuance. This is sometimes the case with the children of God, who are set to bear the yoke in their youth, as it was with Joseph and David; and of them that get it laid on them in their middle age, as it was with Job, who could not be less than forty at his trouble's coming, but after it lived one hundred and forty, Job, xlii. 16. God, by such methods, prepares man for peculiar usefulness.

(2.) Others may be in humbling circumstances long and sore, and quite hopeless in the ordinary course of Providence, yet they may get a clear and warm blink of a lifting up, ere they come to their journey's end. The life of some of God's children is like a cloudy and rainy day, wherein, in the evening, the sun breaks out from under the clouds, shines fair and clear a little, and then sets. "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the light shall not be clear, nor dark. But it shall come to pass, that at evening time it shall be light," Zech. xiv. 6, 7. Such was the case of Jacob in his old age, brought in honour and comfort into Egypt unto his son, and then died.

(3.) Yet whatever liftings up they get in this life, they will never want some weights hanging about them for their humbling. They may have their singing times, but their songs while in this world will be mixed with groanings, 2 Cor. v. 4, "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened." The unmixed dispensation is reserved for the other world; but this will be a wilderness unto the end, where there will be howlings with the most joyful notes.

3. All the liftings up which the humbled meet with now are pledges, and but pledges, samples, and earnests of the great lifting up, abiding them on the other side; and they shall look on them so.

(1.) They are really so, Hos. ii. 15, "And I will give her her vineyards from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope: and she shall sing there as in the days of her youth, and as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt." Our Lord Jesus is leading his people now through the wilderness, and the manna, and water of the rock, are earnests for the time of the milk and honey flowing in the promised land. They are not yet come home to their Father's house, but they are travelling on the road, and Christ their elder Brother with them, Song iv. 8, who bears their expenses, takes them into inns by the way, as it were, and refreshes them with partial liftings up; after which, they must proceed again. But that entertainment by the way is a pledge of the full entertainment he will afford them when they arrive at home.

Object. "But people may get a lifting up in time, that yet is no pledge of a lifting up on the other side: How shall I know it then to be a pledge?"

Ans. That lifting up which comes by the promises, is certainly a pledge of the full lifting up in the other world: for, as the other life is the proper time of the accomplishing of the promises, so we may be sure, that when God once begins to clear his bond, he will certainly hold on till it is fully cleared. "The Lord will perfect that which concerneth me," Psalm cxxxviii. 8. So we may say as Naomi to Ruth, upon her receiving the six measures of barley from Boaz, Ruth, iii. 18, "He will not be in rest until he have finished the thing this day." There are liftings up that come by common providence, and these indeed are single, and not pledges of more; but the promise chains mercies together, so that one got is a pledge of another to come, yea, of the whole chain to the end, 2 Sam. v. 12.

Quest. "But how shall I know the lifting up to come by the way of the promise?"

Ans. That which comes by the way of the promise, does at once come in the low way of humiliation, the high way of faith or believing the promise, and the long way of waiting hope and patient continuance, James, v. 7, "Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold the husbandman waiting for the precious fruits of the earth, and hath long patience for it until he receive the early and latter rain." Humility qualifies for the accomplishment of the promise, faith sucks the breasts of it, and patient waiting hangs by the breast till the milk come abundantly.

(2.) But no liftings up of God's children here are any more than pledges of lifting up. God gives worldly men their stock here, but his children get nothing but a sample of theirs here, Psalm xvii. 14. Even as the servant at the term gets his fee in a round sum, while the young heir gets nothing but a few pence for spending money. The truth is, the same spending money is more valuable than the world's stock, Psalm iv. 7, "Thou hast put gladness in my heart, more than in the time that their corn and their wine increased." But though it is better than that, and their services too, and more worth than all their waiting, yet it is below the honour of their God to put them off with it, Heb. xi. 16, "But now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for he hath prepared for them a city."

2*dly*, The partial lifting up itself. What they will get, getting this lifting up promised to the humbled. Why, they will get, —

1. A removal of their humbling circumstances. God having tried them awhile, and humbled them, and brought down their hearts, will at length take off their burden, remove the weight so long hung on them, and so take them off that part of their trial joyfully, and let them get up their back long bowed down. And this one of two ways:

(1.) Either in kind, removing the burden for good and all. Such a lifting Job got, when the Lord turned back his captivity, increased again his family and substance, which had both been desolated. David, when Saul his persecutor fell in battle, and he was brought to the kingdom after many a weary day, expecting one day to fall by his hand. It is easy with our God to make such turns in the most humbling circumstances.

(2.) Or in equivalent, or as good, removing the weight of the burden, that though it remains, it presses them no more, 2 Cor. xii. 9, 10, "And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee, for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly, therefore, will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me. Therefore I take pleasure in mine infirmities." Though they are not got to the shore, yet their head is no more under the water, but lifted up. David speaks feelingly of such a lifting up, Psalm xxvii. 5, 6, "For in the time of trouble he shall hide me in his pavilion; in the secret of his tabernacle shall he hide me; he shall set me upon a rock. And now shall mine head be lifted up above mine enemies round about me; therefore will I offer in his tabernacle sacrifices of joy; I will sing, yea, I will sing praises unto the Lord." Such had the three children in the fiery furnace; the fire burnt, but it could burn nothing of them but their bonds; they had the warmth and light of it, but nothing of the scorching heat. Sometimes God lifts up his people this way in their humbling circumstances.

2. A comfortable sight of the acceptance of their prayers, put up in their humbling circumstances. While prayers are not answered, but trouble continued, the hangers on about the Lord's hand are apt to think they are not accepted or regarded in heaven, because there is no alteration in their case, Job, ix. 16, 17, "If I had called, and he had answered me, yet would I not believe that he had hearkened unto my voice, for he breaketh me with a tempest." But that is a mistake; they are accepted immediately, though not answered, 1 John, v. 14, "And this is the confidence we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will, he heareth us." The Lord does with them as a father with the letters coming from his son abroad, reads them one by one with pleasure, and carefully lays them up to be answered at his convenience. And when the answer comes, the son will know how acceptable they were to his father, Matt. xv. 28.

3. A heart-satisfying answer of these prayers,—that is, so as they shall not only get the thing, but see they have it as an answer of prayer; and they will put a double value on the mercy, 1 Sam. ii. 1. Accepted prayers may be very long of answering, many years, as in Abraham and David's case, but they cannot miscarry of an answer at length, Psalm ix. 18. The time will come when God will tell out to them, according to the promise, that they shall change their note, and say, Psalm cxvi. 1, "I love the Lord, because he

hath heard my voice, and my supplication." Looking on their lifting up as bearing the signature of the hand of a prayer-hearing God.

4. Full satisfaction, as to the conduct of Providence, in all the steps of humbling circumstances, and the delay of the lifting up, however perplexing these were before, Rev. xv. 3. Standing on the shore, and looking back to what they have passed through, they will be made to say, "He hath done all things well." Those things which are bitter to Christians in the passing through, are very sweet in the reflection on them; so is Samson's riddle verified in their experiences.

5. They get the lifting up, together with the interest for the time they lay out of it. When God pays his bonds of promises, he pays both stock and interest together; the mercy is increased according to the time man waited on, and the expenses and hardships sustained during the dependence of the process. The fruits of common providences are soon ripe, soon rotten; but the fruit of the promise is often long a ripening, but then it is durable: and the longer it is a ripening, it is the more valuable when it comes. Abraham and Sarah waited for the promise about ten years, at length they thought on a way to hasten it, Gen. xvi. 1—6. That soon took in the birth of Ishmael, but he was not the promised son. They were coming into extreme old age ere the promise brought forth, Gen. xviii. 11. But when it came, they got it with an addition of the renewing of their ages, Gen. xxi. 7, and xxv. 1. The most valuable of all the promises was the longest in fulfilling,—namely, the promise of Christ, that was four thousand years.

6. The spiritual enemies that flew thick and throng about them in the time of the darkness of the humbling circumstances, will be scattered at this lifting up in the promise, 1 Sam. ii. 1, 5, "And Hannah prayed and said, My heart rejoiceth in the Lord, my mouth is enlarged over mine enemies. They that were full have hired out themselves for bread, and they that were hungry ceased." Formidable was Pharaoh's host behind the Israelites, while they had the Red Sea before them; but, when they were through the sea, they saw the Egyptians dead on the shore, Exod. xiv. 30. Such a sight will they that humble themselves under humbling circumstances get of their spiritual enemies, when the time comes for the lifting up.

3dly, The due time of this lifting up. That is a very natural question of those in humbling circumstances, "Watchman, what of the night?" And we cannot answer it to the humbled soul, but in general, Isa. xxi. 11, 12. So take these general observations on it.

1. The lifting up of the humbled will not be long, considering the weight of the matter; that is to say, considering the worth and value of the lifting up of the humble; when it comes it can by no means be reckoned long to the time of it. When you sow your corn in the fields, though it does not ripen so soon as some garden-seeds, but you wait three months or so, you do not think the harvest long a coming, considering the value of the crop. This view the apostle takes of the lifting up in humbling circumstances, 2 Cor. iv. 17. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." So that a believer, looking on the promise with an eye of faith, and perceiving its accomplishment, and the worth of it when accomplished, may wonder it is come in so short a time.

2. When the time comes, it and only it, will appear the due time. To every thing there is a season, and a great part of wisdom lies in discerning it, and doing things in the season thereof. And we may be sure infinite Wisdom cannot miss the season, by mistaking it, Deut. xxxii. 4. "He is a rock, his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgment." But whatever God doth will abide the strictest examination in that, as all other points, Eccles. iii. 14, "I know that whatsoever God doth, it shall be for ever; nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it: and God doth it that men may fear before him." It is true, many times appear to us as the due time for lifting up, which yet really is not so, because there are some circumstances hid from us, which renders that season unfit for the thing. Hence, John, vii. 6, "My time is not yet come, but your time is always ready." But when all the circumstances, always foreknown of God, shall come to be opened out, and laid together before us, we shall then see the lifting up is come in the nick of time, most for the honour of God and our good, and that it would not have done so well sooner.

3. When the time comes that is really the due time, the proper time for the lifting up a child of God from his humbling circumstances, it will not be put off one moment longer, Heb. ii. 3. "At the end it shall speak, it will surely come, it will not tarry." Though it tarry, it will not linger nor put off to another time. Oh, what rest of heart would the firm faith of this afford us! There is not a child of God but would, with the utmost earnestness, protest against the lifting up before the due time, as against an unripe fruit cast to him by an angry father that would set his teeth on edge.

4. The humbling circumstances are ordinarily carried to the utmost point of hopelessness before the lifting up. The knife was at Isaac's throat before the voice was heard: 2 Cor. i. 8, 9, "For we would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we

despaired even of life; but we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God, which raiseth the dead." Things soon seem to us arrived at that point; such is the hastiness of our spirits. But things may have far to go down after we think they are at the foot of the hill. And we are almost as little competent judges of the point of hopelessness, as of the due time of lifting up. But generally God carries his people's humbling circumstances downward, still downward, till they come to that point. Two reasons are to be noticed.

(1.) One from the explanatory cause of it. Herein God is holding the same course which he held in the case of the man Christ, the beloved pattern copied after in all the dispensations of Providence towards the Church, and every particular believer, Rom. viii. 29. He was all along a man of sorrows; as his time went on, the waters swelled more, till he was brought to the dust of death; then he was buried, and the grave-stone sealed; which done, the world thought they were freely quit of him, and he would trouble them no more. But they quite mistook it: then, and not till then, was the due time for lifting him up. And the liftings up that his people get most remarkably, are only little pieces fashioned after this grand pattern.

(2.) Another from the final cause, the end and design Providence aims at in it, and that is to carry the believer clean off his own, and all created foundations, to place his trust and hope in the Lord alone, 2 Cor. i. 9, "That we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead."

5. Due preparation of the heart for the lifting up out of humbling circumstances, goes before the due time of that lifting up, according to the promise. It is not so in every lifting up; the liftings up of the common providences are not so critically managed; men will have them, will want them no longer, and God flings them to them in anger, ere they are prepared for them, Hos. xiii. 11. "I gave thee a king in mine anger." They can by no means abide the trial, and God takes them off as reprobate silver that is not able to abide it, Jer. vi. 29, 30.

This due preparation consists in a due humiliation, Psal. x. 17. And it often takes much work to bring about this, which is another point that we are very incompetent judges of. We should have thought Job was brought very low in his spirit by the providence of God bruising him on the one hand, and his friends on the other, for a long time: Yet after all he had endured both ways, God saw it necessary to speak to himself, for his humiliation, chap. xxxviii. 1. By that speech of God himself he was brought to his knees, chap. xl. 4, 5. And we should have thought he was then sufficiently humbled; and perhaps he thought so himself too. But God saw a farther degree of humiliation necessary, and therefore just begins anew again to speak for his humiliation, which at length laid him in the dust, chap. xlii. 5, 6. And when he was thus prepared for lifting up, he obtained it.

There are six things, I conceive, belonging to this humiliation, preparatory to lifting up.

1. A deep sense of sinfulness and unworthiness of being lifted up at all, Job, xl. 4. "Behold I am vile, what shall I answer thee? I will lay mine hand upon my mouth." People may be long in humbling circumstances, ere they be brought this length; even good men are much prejudiced in their own favour, and may so far forget themselves as to think God deals his favours unequally, and is more severe on them than on others. Elihu marketh this wrong in Job, under his humbling circumstances, Job, xxxiii. 10—12. And I believe it will be found, there is readily a greater keenness to vindicate our honour from the imputation the humbling circumstances seem to lay upon it, than to vindicate the honour of God in the justice and equity of the dispensation. The blindness of an ill-natured world, still ready to suspect the worst causes for humbling circumstances, as if the greatest sufferers were surely the greatest sinners, Luke, xiii. 4, gives a handle for this bias of the corrupt nature. But God is a jealous God, and when he appears sufficiently to humble, he will cause the matter of our honour to give way, like a sandy brae under our feet, while we shall be obliged to apply earnestly to the vindication of his.

2. A resignation to the divine pleasure, as to the time of lifting up. God gives the promise, leaving the time blank as to us. Our time is always ready, and we rashly fill it up at our own hand. God does not keep our time, because it is not the due time. Hence we are ready to think his word fails; whereas it is but our own harsh conclusion from it that fails, Psal. cxvi. 11. "I said in my haste, all men are liars." Several of the saints have gotten on the finger ends by this means, and thereby learned to let alone filling up that blank. The first promise was thus used by believing Eve, Gen. iv. 1. Another promise was so by believing Abraham, after about ten years on-waiting, Gen. xvi. another by David, forecited, Psalm cxvi. 11.

If this be the case of any child of God, let them not be discouraged upon it, thinking they were over rash in applying the promise to themselves; they were only so in applying the time to the promise,—a mistake that saints in all ages have made, which they repented, and saw the folly of, and let alone that point for the time to come; and then the promise was fulfilled in its own due time. Let them in such circumstances go and do likewise, leaving the time entirely to the Lord.

3. An entire resignation as to the way and manner of bringing it about. We are ready to do, as to the way of accomplishing the promise, just as with the time of it, to set a particular way for the Lord's working of it; and if that be not kept, the proud heart is stumbled, 2 Kings, v. 11, "But Naaman was wroth, and he went away, and said, Behold I thought he will surely come out to me, and stand and call on the name of the Lord his God, and strike his hand over the place." But the Lord will have his people broke off from that too, that they shall prescribe no way to him, but leave that to him entirely, as in that same case, ver. 14, "He went down and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God,—and he was clean." The compass of our knowledge of ways and means is very narrow, as, if one is blocked up, oft-times we cannot see another; but our God knows many ways of relief, where we know but one or none at all; and it is very usual for the Lord to bring the lifting up of his people in a way they had no view to, after repeated disappointments from those places whence they had great expectation.

4. Resignation as to the degree of the lifting up, yea, and as to the very being of it in time. The Lord will have his people weaned so, that however hasty they have sometimes been, that they behoved to be so soon lifted up, and could no longer bear, they shall be brought at length to set no time at all, but submit to go to the grave under their weight, if it seem good in the Lord's eyes; and in that case they will be brought to be content with any measure of it in time, without ascribing how much, 2 Sam. xv. 25, 26, "If I shall find favour in the eyes of the Lord, he will bring me again. But if he thus say, I have no delight in thee, behold, here am I, let him do as seemeth good unto him."

5. The continuing of praying and waiting on the Lord in the case, Eph. vi. 18, "Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance." It is pride of heart, and unsubduedness of spirit, that makes people give over praying and waiting, because their humbling circumstances are lengthened out time after time, 2 Kings, vi. 33. But due humility, going before the lifting up, brings men into that temper, to pray, wait, and endure resolutely, setting no time for the giving it over, till the lifting up come, whether in time or eternity, Lam. iii. 49, 50.

6. Mourning under mismanagements in the trial, Job, xlii. 3, "Therefore have I uttered that I understood not, things too wonderful for me, which I knew not." The proud heart dwells and expatiates on the man's sufferings in the trial, and casts out all the folds of the trial, on that side, and views them again and again. But when the Spirit of God comes duly to humble, in order to lifting up, he will cause the man to pass, in a sort, the suffering side of the trial, and turn his eyes on his own conduct in it, ransack it, judge himself impartially, and condemn himself; so that his mouth will be stopped. This is that humility that goeth before the lifting up in time, in the way of the promise.

Secondly, We proceed to consider the lifting up as brought about at the end of time, in the other world. And,

1*st*, A word as to the nature of this lifting up. Concerning it we shall say these five things: —

1. There is a certainty of this lifting up, in all cases of the humbled under humbling circumstances. Though one cannot, in every case, make them sure of a lifting up in time, yet they may be assured, be the case what it may, they will, without all peradventure, get a lifting up on the other side, 2 Cor. v. 1, "For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Though God's humble children may both breakfast and dine on bread of adversity, and water of affliction, they will be sure to sup sweetly and plentifully. And the believing expectation of the latter might serve to qualify the former, and make them easy under it.

2. It will be a perfect lifting up, Heb. xii. 23. They will be perfectly delivered out of their particular trials, and special furnace, be what it will, that made them weary many a day. Lazarus was then delivered from his poverty and sores, and lying at the rich man's gate, Luke, xvi. 22, and fully delivered. Yea, they will get a lifting up from all their humbling circumstances together. All the imperfections will then be at an end, inferiority in relations, contradictions, afflictions, uncertainty, and sin. If it was long a coming, there will be a blessed moment when they shall get all together.

3. They will not only be raised out of their low condition, but they will be set up on high, as Joseph: not only brought out of prison, but made ruler over the land of Egypt. And they will be lifted up,

(1.) Into a high place, Luke, xvi. 22, "The beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom." Now they are at best but in a low place upon this earth; there they will be seated in the highest heavens, Phil. i. 23, with Eph. iv. 10. Often, in their humbling circumstances, they are obliged now to embrace dunghills; then they will be set with Christ on his throne, Rev. iii. 21, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne." Though their belly now cleaves to the earth, and men say, Bow down, that we may pass over you, they will then be settled in the heavenly mansions, above the sun, moon, and stars.

(2.) Into a high state and condition, a state of perfection. Out of all their trouble and uneasiness, they will be set into a state of rest; from their mean and inglorious condition, they will be advanced into a state of glory; their afflicted and sorrowful life, will be succeeded with a fulness of joy; and, for their humbling circumstances, they will be clothed with eternal glory and honour.

4. It will be a final lifting up, after which there will be no more casting down for ever, Rev. vii. 16. When we get a lifting up in time, we are apt to imagine fondly we are at the end of our trials; but we soon find we are too hasty in our conclusions, and the cloud returns, Psalm xxx. 6, 7, "In my prosperity I said, I shall never be moved. Thou didst hide thy face, and I was troubled." But then, indeed, the trial is quite over, the fight is at an end, and then is the time of the retribution and triumph.

5. There will not be the least remaining uneasiness from the humbling circumstances, but, on the contrary, they will have a glorious and desirable effect. I make no question but the saints will have the remembrance of the humbling circumstances they were under here below. Did the rich man in hell remember his having five brethren on the earth—how sumptuously he fared—how Lazarus sat at his gate; and can we doubt but the saints will remember perfectly their heavy trials? Rev. vi. 10. But then they will remember them as waters that fail; as the man recovered to health remembers his tossings on the sick bed; and that is a way of remembering that sweetens the present state of health beyond what otherwise it would be. Certainly the shore of the Red Sea was the place that, of all places, was the fittest to help the Israelites to sing in the highest key, Rev. xv. 3. And the humbling circumstances of saints on the earth will be of the same use to them in heaven.

2*d*, A word to the due time of this lifting up. There is a particular, definite time for it in every saint's case, which is the due time, but it is hid from us. We can only say in general,

1. Then is the due time for it, when our work we have to do in this world is over. God has appointed every one their task, fight, trial, and work; and, till that is done, we are in a sort immortal, John, ix. 4, and xi. 9. That work is,

(1.) Doing work; work set to us, by the great Master, to be done for the honour of God and the good of our fellow-creatures, Eccles. ix. 10. We must be content to be doing on, even in our humbling circumstances, till that be done out. It is not the due time for that lifting up, till we are at the end of that work, and so have served our generation.

(2.) Suffering work. There is a certain portion of suffering that is allotted for the mystical body; and the Head has divided to the several members their portions thereof; and it is not the due time for that lifting up, till we have exhausted the share thereof allotted to us. Paul looked on his life as a going on in that, Col. i. 24.

2. When that lifting up comes, we shall see it is come exactly in the due time; that it was well it was neither sooner nor later; for though heaven is always better than earth, and that it would be better for us, absolutely speaking, to be in heaven than on earth, yet certainly there is a time wherein it is better for the honour of God, and his service, that we be on the earth than in heaven, Phil. i. 24, "Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." And it will be no grief of heart to them, when there, that they were so long in their humbling circumstances, and were not brought sooner.

Use 1. Let not, then, the humble cast away their confidence, whatever their humbling circumstances be; let them assure themselves there will come a lifting up to them at length; if not here, yet to be sure hereafter. Let them keep this in their view, and comfort themselves with it, for God has said it, Psal. ix. 18, "The needy shall not always be forgotten." If the night were ever so long, the morning will come at length.

Use 2. Let patience have her perfect work. The husbandman waits for the return of his seed, the sea-merchant for the return of his ships, the store-master for what he calls year-time, when he draws in the produce of his flocks. All these have long patience, and why should not the Christian too have patience, and patiently wait for the time appointed for his lifting up?

You have heard much of the Crook in the Lot; the excellency of humbleness of spirit in a low lot, beyond pride of spirit, though joined with a high one: You have been called to humble yourselves in your humbling circumstances, and have been assured in that case of a lifting up. To conclude: We may assure ourselves, "God will at length break in pieces the proud, be they ever so high; and he will triumphantly lift up the humble, be they ever so low."

THE END.

PRINTED BY ANDREW SHORTREDE, EDINBURGH.

LETTERS

ON THE

DIVINITY OF CHRIST,

ADDRESSED TO THE

m llery
REV. W. E. CHANNING,

IN ANSWER TO HIS SERMON "ON THE DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY."

BY

MOSES STUART,

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF SACRED LITERATURE IN THE THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY, ANDOVER, U. S.

EDINBURGH:
Printed by ANDREW SHORTREDE, Thistle Lane.

LETTERS

ON THE

DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

LETTER I.

Reverend and Dear Sir,

I have recently perused a sermon delivered by you at the ordination of the Reverend J. Sparks, in Baltimore, with no small degree of interest. The subjects of which it treats must be regarded as highly important, by every intelligent man who is a serious inquirer after revealed truth. And if the views which you have disclosed will stand the test of examination, and shall appear to be those which the word of God maintains, or which it will justify, it certainly will be the duty of every friend to Christianity to embrace and promote them.

It is proper, no doubt, that every one who reads and reflects upon your sermon, should do it without prejudice or party views. Unless I am deceived as to the state of my own feelings, I have endeavoured impartially to weigh the arguments, and examine the reasonings which it presents, with a wish to know and believe the truth. I dare not flatter myself, indeed, that I have perfectly succeeded in doing this: for every man who is acquainted with his own heart, will find reason to believe that he often has been, and may be again, deceived by it. But, as I am not conscious of party feelings on the present occasion, will you permit me, without apology, to lay before you my thoughts in regard to three topics of your discourse that stand in close connection with each other, and are among the principal points in regard to which I feel myself compelled to dissent from your opinions?

The points to which I refer are — *the principles of interpreting Scripture; the unity of God;* and *the divinity and humanity of the Saviour.* I limit myself to these three, because it would require more time and labour than I can possibly spare at present, and more health than I enjoy, to express in writing my views of all the statements of doctrines which you have made. I might adduce another reason for confining myself within these limits. If the principles of reasoning which you adopt, and the results which you deduce from them, in regard to some of the points on which I am about to remark, are untenable or incorrect, the consequence of this must extend itself *essentially* to some of the remaining and most important topics which you have discussed in your sermon.

The general principles of interpreting Scripture you describe in the following manner.

> "We regard the Scriptures as the records of God's successive revelations to mankind, and particularly of the last and most perfect revelation of his will by Jesus Christ. Whatever doctrines seem to us to be clearly taught in the Scriptures, we receive without reserve or exception. We do not, however, attach equal importance to all the books in this collection. Our religion, we believe, lies chiefly in the New Testament. The dispensation of Moses, compared with that of Jesus, we consider as imperfect, earthly, obscure, adapted to the childhood of the human race, a preparation for a nobler system, and chiefly useful now as serving to confirm and illustrate the Christian Scriptures. Jesus Christ is the only master of Christians: and whatever he taught, either during his personal ministry, or by his inspired Apostles, we regard as of divine authority, and profess to make the rule of our lives.
>
> "This authority which we give to the Scriptures, is a reason, we conceive, for studying them with peculiar care, and for inquiring anxiously into the principles of interpretation by which their true meaning may be ascertained. The principles adopted by the class of Christians in whose name I speak, need to be explained, because they are often misunderstood. We are particularly accused of making an unwarrantable use of reason in the interpretation of Scripture. We are said to exalt reason above revelation, to prefer our own wisdom to God's. Loose and undefined charges of this kind are circulated so freely, and with such injurious intentions, that we think it due to ourselves, and to the cause

of truth, to express our views with some particularity.

"Our leading principle in interpreting Scripture is this, that the Bible is a book written for men, in the language of men, and that its meaning is to be sought in the same manner as that of other books. We believe that God, when he condescends to speak and write, submits, if we may so say, to the established rules of speaking and writing. How else would the Scriptures avail us, more than if communicated in an unknown tongue?

"Now, all books and all conversation require in the reader or hearer the constant exercise of reason; or their true import is only to be obtained by continual comparison and inference. Human language, you well know, admits various interpretations; and every word and every sentence must be modified and explained, according to the subject which is discussed, according to the purposes, feelings, circumstances, and principles of the writer, and according to the genius and idioms of the language which he uses. These are acknowledged principles in the intrepretation of human writings; and a man whose words we should explain without reference to these principles, would reproach us justly with a criminal want of candour, and an intention of obscuring or distorting his meaning.

"Were the Bible written in a language and style of its own, did it consist of words which admit but a single sense, and of sentences wholly detached from each other, there would be no place for the principles now laid down. We could not reason about it as about other writings. But such a book would be of little worth; and, perhaps, of all books, the Scriptures correspond least to this description.

"The word of God bears the stamp of the same hand which we see in his works. It has infinite connections and dependencies. Every proposition is linked with others, and is to be compared with others, that its full and precise import may be understood. Nothing stands alone. The New Testament is built on the Old. The Christian dispensation is a continuation of the Jewish, the completion of a vast scheme of Providence, requiring great extent of view in the reader. Still more, the Bible treats of subjects on which we receive ideas from other sources besides itself; such subjects as the nature, passions, relations, and duties of man; and it expects us to restrain and modify its language by the known truths which observation and experience furnish on these topics.

"We profess not to know a book which demands a more frequent exercise of reason than the Bible. In addition to the remarks now made on its infinite connections, we may observe that its style nowhere affects the precision of science or the accuracy of definition. Its language is singularly glowing, bold, and figurative, demanding more frequent departures from the literal sense than that of our own age and country, and consequently demands more continual exercise of judgment. We find, too, that the different portions of this book, instead of being confined to general truths, refer perpetually to the times when they were written, to states of society, to modes of thinking, to controversies in the Church, to feelings and usages, which have passed away, and without the knowledge of which we are constantly in danger of extending to all times and places what was of temporary and local application. We find, too, that some of these books are strongly marked by the genius and character of their respective writers, that the Holy Spirit did not so guide the Apostles as to suspend the peculiarities of their minds, and that a knowledge of their feelings, and of the influences under which they were placed, is one of the preparations for understanding their writings. With these views of the Bible, we feel it our bounden duty to exercise our reason upon it perpetually; to compare, to infer, to look beyond the letter to the spirit, to seek in the nature of the subject and the aim of the writer, his true meaning; and, in general, to make use of what is known, for explaining what is difficult, and for discovering new truths.

"Need I descend to particulars to prove that the Scriptures demand the exercise of reason? Take, for example, the style in which they generally speak of God, and observe how habitually they apply to him human passions and organs. Recollect the declarations of Christ, that he came not to send peace, but a sword; that unless we eat his flesh, and drink his blood, we have no life in us; that we must hate father and mother; pluck out the right eye; and a vast number of passages equally bold and unlimited. Recollect the unqualified manner in which it is said of Christians that they possess all things, know all things, and can do all things. Recollect the verbal contradiction between Paul and James, and the apparent clashing of some parts of Paul's writings, with the general doctrines and end of Christianity. I might extend the enumeration indefinitely, and who does not see that we must limit all these passages by the known attributes of God, of Jesus Christ, and of human nature, and by the circumstances under which they were written, so as to give the language a quite different import from what it would require, had it been applied to different beings, or used in different connections?

"Enough has been said to shew in what sense we make use of reason in interpreting Scripture. From a variety of possible interpretations, we select that which accords with the nature of the subject, and the state of the writer, with the connection of the passage, with the general strain of Scripture, with the known character and will of God, and with the obvious and acknowledged laws of nature. In other words, we believe that God never contradicts in one part of Scripture what he teaches in another, and never contradicts in revelation what he teaches in his works and providence; and we therefore distrust every interpretation which, after deliberate attention, seems repugnant to any established truth. We reason about the Bible precisely as civilians do about the constitution under which we live; who, you know, are accustomed to limit one provision of that venerable instrument by others, and to fix the precise import of its parts, by inquiring into its general spirit, into the intentions of its authors, and into the prevalent feelings, impressions, and circumstances of the time when it was framed. Without these principles of interpretation, we frankly acknowledge that we cannot defend the divine authority of the Scriptures. Deny us this latitude, and we must abandon this book to its enemies." Pp. 3—6.

To a great part of these principles I give my cheerful and most cordial assent. They are the principles which I apply to the explanation of the Scriptures from day to day, in my private studies and in my public labours. They are the principles by which I am led to embrace the opinions that I have espoused, and by which, so far as I am able, I expect to defend these opinions, whenever called in duty to do it.

While I thus give my cordial approbation to most of the above extract from your sermon, will you indulge me in expressing a wish that the rank and value of the Old Testament, in the Christian's library, had been described in somewhat different terms? I do most fully accord with the idea that the Gospel, or the New Testament, is more perfect than the Mosaic Law, or than the Old Testament. On what other ground can the assertions of Paul, in 2 Corinthians, iii. in Hebrews, viii, and in other places, be believed or justified? The Gospel gives a clearer view than the Jewish Scriptures of our duty and of our destiny—of the objects of our hopes and fears—of the character of God and the way of salvation. I agree fully, that whatever in the Old Testament respects the Jews, simply as Jews,—*e. g.* their ritual, their food, their dress, their civil polity, their government,—in a word, whatever from its nature was *national* and *local*,—is not binding upon us under the Christian dispensation.

I am well satisfied, too, that the character of God and the duty of men were, in many respects, less clearly revealed under the ancient dispensation than they now are. "The law was given by Moses;" but "no man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten, who dwelleth in the bosom of the Father, *he hath revealed him*,"—*i. e.* it was reserved for Christ to make a *full* display of the divine character; no man, no prophet who preceded him, ever had such knowledge of God as enabled him to do it. I am aware that many Christians do not seem to understand this passage; and, with well-meaning but mistaken views, undertake to deduce the character and designs of God as fully and as clearly from the Old Testament as from the New.

I must believe, too, that the *duties* of Christians are, in most respects, more fully and definitely taught in the Gospel than in the Old Testament; and I cannot approve of that method of reasoning which deduces our duties principally from texts in the Old Testament, that sometimes are less clear, when the New Testament presents the same subjects in such characters of light that he who runneth may read.

But when you say, "Jesus Christ is the only master of Christians; and whatever he taught, either during his personal ministry or by his inspired Apostles, we regard as of divine authority, and profess to make the rule of our lives," does not this naturally imply, that we are absolved from obligation to receive the Old Testament in any sense as our guide; and that what it teaches we are not bound "to make the rule of our lives?" I do not feel certain that it was your design to affirm this; but the words in their connection seem naturally to bear this import. To such a view I should object, that those parts of the Old Testament which express the will of God, in reference to the great points of duty, that must, from the nature of moral beings, be for ever the same under every dispensation, may be and ought to be regarded as unrepealed. It is a very sound maxim, in the interpretation of divine as well as human laws,—*manente ratione, manet ipsa lex—a law is unrepealed while the reason of that law continues.* Express repeal only can exempt a law from the application of this maxim. And when our Saviour says, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in nowise pass from the law till all be fulfilled," he seems to me plainly to have declared the immutability of the ancient *moral* law, in the sense already explained.

What shall we say, moreover, of the devotional parts of the Old Testament, (the Book of Psalms, for instance,)or of those numerous prophetical parts which are sermons on the duties and obligations of men, or predictions of a future Messiah, and of the nature and prosperity of his Church? Are these any more Jewish (except as to the garb in which they are clothed) than Christian? I admit that they are less perfect than that which the New Testament furnishes on the same topics: but I believe them to be sanctioned by the same authority, and to require a similar respect and deference.

In regard to what you say respecting the leading principle of interpreting Scripture, I cannot hesitate to declare, that nothing is clearer to my apprehension, than that God, when he speaks to men, speaks in such language as is used by those whom he addresses. Of course, the language of the Bible is to be interpreted by the same laws, so far as philology is concerned, as that of any other book. I ask with you, How else is the Bible a *revelation?* How else can men ever come to agree in what manner the Scripture should be interpreted, or feel any assurance that they understand the meaning of its language?

I find little from which I should dissent, in the remainder of your observations upon the general *principles* of interpretation. I might perhaps make some objections to the manner in which the office of reason, in the interpretation of Scripture, is occasionally described. But I am confident that I admit, as fully as you do or can do, the *proper office* of reason in the whole matter of religion, both in regard to doctrine and practice.

It is to our reason the arguments which

prove the divine origin of Christianity are addressed; and it is by reason that we prove, or are led to admit this origin, on general or historical grounds. Reason prescribes, or at any rate develops and sanctions, the laws of interpreting Scripture. The cases mentioned by you, in which reason must be exercised, are in general striking exemplifications of this. But when reason is satisfied that the Bible is the book of God, by proof which she cannot reject, and yet preserve her character — and when she has decided what laws of exegesis the nature of human language requires, — the office that remains for her, in regard to the Scripture, is the application of those laws to the actual interpretation of the Bible. When, by their application, she becomes satisfied with respect to what the sacred writers really meant to declare in any case, she admits it without hesitation, whether it be a doctrine, the relation of a fact, or a precept. It is the highest office of reason to believe doctrines and facts which God has asserted to be true, and to submit to his precepts, although many things, in regard to the manner in which those facts and doctrines can be explained, or those precepts vindicated, may be beyond her reach. In short, the Scriptures being once admitted to be the word of God, or of divine authority, the sole office of reason in respect to them is to act as an *interpreter* of revelation, and not in any case as a *legislator*. Reason can only judge of the laws of exegesis, and direct the application of them, in order to discover simply what the sacred writers meant to assert. This being discovered, it is either to be received as they have asserted it, or their divine authority must be rejected, and our obligation to believe all which they assert, denied. There is no other alternative. Philosophy has no right to interfere here. If she ever interferes, it must be when the question is pending, whether the Bible is divine. Nor has system, prejudice, sectarian feeling, orthodoxy, or heterodoxy, so called, any right to interfere. The claims of the Bible to be authoritative being once admitted, the simple question in respect to it is, What does it teach? In regard to any particular passage, What idea did the original mean to convey? When this is ascertained by the legitimate rules of interpretation, it is authoritative,—this is *orthodoxy* in the highest and best sense of the word; and every thing which is opposed to it, which modifies it, which fritters its meaning away, is *heterodoxy*, is *heresy*, to whatever name or party it is attached.

I presume you will agree without hesitation to these remarks. The grand Protestant maxim, that *the Bible is our only and sufficient rule of faith and practice*, implies most clearly the very principles which I have stated; and these every man must admit, that acknowledges the paramount claims of the Bible to be believed, and has any tolerable acquaintance with the subject of its interpretation.

If there be any thing to which I should object in your statement, generally considered, of the laws of interpretation, it is rather the colouring which has been given to some of the language in which it is expressed. You commence by saying, that your party are charged with "exalting reason above revelation—with preferring their own wisdom to God's;" and that these charges are "circulated freely, and with injurious intentions." You will readily acknowledge, as a general fact, that there is difficulty in giving an impartial statement of opinions, which we thus strongly feel to have been misrepresented. We certainly are under temptation, in such cases, to set off our own opinions to the best advantage, and to place those of our opponents in the most repulsive attitude. And although Trinitarians, in fact, differ less from you, in respect to the laws of interpretation, than you seem to have apprehended, the belief, on your part, that a wider difference existed, seems to have given a peculiar cast to some sentences which simple discussion would hardly admit.

With the two last paragraphs of your sermon that are quoted above, I wish not to be understood as signifying that I entirely agree.

It is, however, rather from the *application* of some exegetical principles which is made in them, than from the principles themselves, that I dissent. I shall have occasion to remark hereafter on this subject. I have mentioned it now, merely to prevent any mistake with regard to the meaning of what I say here upon the laws of interpretation, as exhibited by you.

It would have given me pleasure to find you unconditionally admitting that the general principles of interpretation which you defend are not original, nor peculiar to your party. But you seem to qualify this, by saying that "*all Christians* OCCASIONALLY *adopt them*." If I understood you rightly, then, you would concede, that only Unitarians admit substantially the *system of exegesis* which you have described, and practise upon it. In this, however, (if this be your meaning,) you are mistaken, at least it appears plainly so to me, in respect to the divines who, at the present time, are called *orthodox*. I doubt whether any man can study the science of interpretation, for a considerable time together, without adopting those *principles* of it, *for substance*, which you seem to claim appropriately for Unitarians.

How can it be explained, then, supposing you and I are both sincerely seeking after truth, and both adopt, for substance, the same maxims of interpretation, that we should differ so widely in the results that flow from the application of these principles? Perhaps some light may be cast upon this question in the sequel of these Letters.

LETTER II.

Reverend and Dear Sir,

It would be very gratifying to find, in your sermon, as much respecting the doctrine of the Trinity with which I might accord, as in your principles of interpretation. My apprehensions respecting this doctrine, however, differ from yours. It is not without examination and reflection that I have embraced my present views of it; and the perusal of your statement of the doctrine in question, and your arguments against it, have not persuaded me that my views are erroneous.

You will not expect me, however, in these Letters, which are intended to be brief, to go into a discussion of this great subject, which shall embrace all the important topics which it presents. I intend to touch on those points only on which the hinge of the controversy seems to me to turn; and on these in a manner as summary as the nature and difficulty of the case will permit.

The statement which you make of your own faith in regard to the unity of God, and your account of the doctrine of the Trinity, are as follow.

"*First.* We believe in the doctrine of God's UNITY, or that there is one God, and one only. To this truth we give infinite importance, and we feel ourselves bound to take heed, lest any man spoil us of it by vain philosophy. The proposition, *that there is one God*, seems to us exceedingly plain. We understand by it, that there is one being, one mind, one person, one intelligent agent, and one only, to whom underived and infinite perfection and dominion belong. We conceive that these words could have conveyed no other meaning to the simple and uncultivated people who were set apart to be the depositaries of this great truth, and who were utterly incapable of understanding those hairbreadth distinctions between *being* and *person*, which the sagacity of later ages has discovered. We find no intimation that this language was to be taken in an unusual sense, or that God's unity was a quite different thing from the oneness of other intelligent beings.

"We object to the doctrine of the Trinity, that it subverts the unity of God. According to this doctrine, there are three infinite and equal persons, possessing supreme divinity, called the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Each of these persons, as described by theologians, has his own particular consciousness, will, and perceptions. They love each other, converse with each other, and delight in each other's society. They perform different parts in man's redemption, each having his appropriate office, and neither doing the work of the other. The Son is Mediator, and not the Father. The Father sends the Son, and is not himself sent; nor is he conscious, like the Son, of taking flesh. Here then we have three intelligent agents, possessed of different consciousnesses, different wills, and different perceptions, performing different acts, and sustaining different relations; and if these things do not imply and constitute three minds or beings, we are utterly at a loss to know how three minds or beings are to be formed. It is difference of properties, and acts, and consciousness, which leads us to the belief of different intelligent beings, and if this mark fail us, our whole knowledge fails,—we have no proof that all the agents and persons in the universe are not one and the same mind. When we attempt to conceive of three Gods, we can do nothing more than represent to ourselves three agents, distinguished from each other by similar marks and peculiarities to those which separate the persons of the Trinity; and when common Christians hear these persons spoken of as conversing with each other, loving each other, and performing different acts, how can they help regarding them as different beings, different minds?" Pp. 8, 9.

My object, in *this* letter, is not to controvert your creed, but to consider your representation of the doctrine of the Trinity, as stated, believed, and defended by those with whom I am accustomed to think and act.

Admitting that you have given a fair account of our belief, I cannot see, indeed, why we are not virtually guilty of Tritheism, or at least of something which approximates so near to it, that I acknowledge myself unable to distinguish it from Tritheism. But I cannot help feeling that you have made neither an impartial nor a correct statement of what we believe, and what we are accustomed to teach and defend.

It needs but a moderate acquaintance with the history of the doctrine in question to satisfy any one that a great variety of explanations have been attempted by inquisitive or by adventurous minds. All acknowledge the difficulty of the subject; I regret to say, that some have not refrained from treating it as though it were more within their comprehension than it is.

But, among all the different explanations which I have found, I have not met with any one which denied, or at least was designed to deny, the UNITY OF GOD. All admit this to be a fundamental principle; all acknowledge that it is designated in characters of light, both in the Jewish and Christian revelations; and that to deny it, would be the grossest absurdity, as well as impiety.

It may indeed be questioned, whether the explanations given of the doctrine of the Trinity, by some who have speculated on this subject, are consistent with the divine unity, when the language which they use is interpreted agreeably to the common laws of exegesis. But, that their representations were not *designed* to call in question the *divine unity*, is what I think every candid reader of their works will be disposed to admit.

Now, when I consider this fact, so plain and so easily established, and then look at the method in which you state the doctrine of the

Trinity, as exhibited above, I confess it gives me pain to think that you have not conceded or even intimated that Trinitarians do or can admit the unity of God. You have a right to say, if you so think, that the doctrine of the Trinity, as they explain and defend it, is at variance with the *divine unity*, and that these two things are inconsistent with each other. But, to appropriate to those solely, who call themselves Unitarians, the belief that there is but one God — or to construct an account of the Trinitarian creed (as it seems to me you have done in the paragraph on which I am remarking), so as not even to intimate to your hearers or readers that your opponents admit or advocate the *divine unity*, — is doing that which you would censure in an antagonist, and which cannot well serve the interests of truth.

But let us examine your statement of our creed.

> " We object to the doctrine of the Trinity, that it subverts the unity of God. According to this doctrine, there are three infinite and equal persons, possessing supreme divinity, called the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Each of these persons, as described by theologians, has his own particular consciousness, will, and perceptions. They love each other, converse with each other, and delight in each other's society. They perform different parts in man's redemption,—each having his appropriate office, and neither doing the work of the other. The Son is Mediator, and not the Father; the Father sends the Son, and is not himself sent; nor is he conscious, like the Son, of taking flesh. Here then we have three intelligent agents, possessed of different consciousnesses, different wills, and different perceptions, performing different acts and sustaining different relations; and if these things do not imply and constitute three minds or beings, we are utterly at a loss to know how three minds or beings are to be formed." P. 9.

Is not this account a very different one from that which many of your brethren are accustomed to give of us? By them it is said, that there is a great discordance and contradictory statements and explanations of the doctrine of the Trinity among those who embrace it. Do not you amalgamate us altogether, make us harmonious Tritheists, and then give us over to the reproach of Tritheism, or at least of glaring inconsistency?

After all, the statement which you exhibit of our views is very far from that which we (or at least all Trinitarians with whom I am acquainted) make of our belief. I do not deny that *some* writers have given grounds for a statement not very diverse from yours, as it regards the doctrine of the Trinity. Even some great and good men, in their zeal to defend this doctrine, have sought to reduce the whole subject to human comprehension. How vain the attempt, experience has demonstrated. Efforts of this nature, however well designed or ably conducted, never yet have led to any thing but greater darkness. " Who can by searching find out God? Who can find out the Almighty to perfection?"

But though I readily admit that efforts to explain what in the nature of the case is inexplicable, may have misled some in their exertions to acquire religious knowledge, or given occasion to others of stumbling, yet I am not prepared to admit that the great body of Trinitarians have given just occasion to charge them with a denial of the *unity of God*, or with opinions subversive of this. You certainly ought not to deny them the same liberty, in the use of terms, which all men take on difficult subjects, for the accurate description of which language is not framed, perhaps is not in its nature adequate. They must discuss such subjects by using figurative language, by using terms which (if I may be indulged the liberty of speaking thus) *approximate* as nearly to the expression of the ideas that they mean to convey, as any which they can select. If there is any obscurity in these general observations, I hope it will be cleared up in the remarks that are to follow.

Since I refuse assent to your statement of our belief, you will feel a right to inquire what we do believe, that you may compare this with the doctrine of divine unity, and judge for yourself whether it is subversive of it or not. I cannot refuse my assent to a proposal so reasonable; nor do I feel any inclination to shrink from the task of stating our belief, and then to proffer the excuse, that every thing respecting the subject is too mysterious and recondite to be the object of distinct contemplation. What we do believe can be stated—what we do *not* profess to define or explain can be stated, and the reasons why we do not attempt definition or explanation: and this is what I shall now attempt.

I must not, however, be understood as pledging myself that those, in general, with whom I am accustomed to think and act, will adopt my statement, and maintain that it exhibits the best method of explaining or defending the great doctrine in question. Notwithstanding we are so often charged with adherence to forms and modes of expression contained in creeds, we use as great a variety of language, in giving instruction with regard to the doctrine of the Trinity, as with respect to the other doctrines of religion. In regard to the statement which I shall make, I can say only, that it is not the result of concert, in any degree, with my clerical brethren, for the purpose of making a statement to which they will adhere. It is the result of investigation and reflection on the subject as it appears to be exhibited in the Scriptures, and in the writings of the leading divines whom I have been able to consult.

I believe, then,

I. That God is ONE: *numerically one, in essence and attributes.* In other words, the infinitely perfect Spirit, the Creator and Preserver of all things, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, has *numerically* the same *essence,* and the *same perfections,* so far as they are known to us. To particularize: the Son possesses not simply a *similar* or *equal* essence and perfections, but *numerically the same* as the Father, without division, and without multiplication.

II. The Son (and also the Holy Spirit,) does in some respect, *truly* and *really,* not merely nominally or logically, differ from the Father.

I am aware, as I have hinted above, that you may find writers upon the doctrine of the Trinity, who have stated the subject of my first proposition in a manner somewhat different. But, after making due allowance for inattention to precision of language, the difficulty of the subject, and the various ways which men naturally take to illustrate a difficult subject, I am not aware that many of them would dissent substantially from the statement now made. Certain it is, that the Lutheran Confession exhibits the same view. The words are,—"The divine essence is ONE, which is called, and is, God, eternal, incorporeal, indivisible, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the Creator, and Preserver of all things visible and invisible." Art. 1.

The Confession of Helvetia (written A. D. 1566) declares, that "God is ONE in essence or nature, subsisting by himself, all-sufficient in himself, invisible, without a body, infinite, eternal, the Creator of all things visible and invisible," &c. It adds, "We detest the multitude of Gods, because it is expressly written, The Lord thy God is one God," &c.

The Confession of Basil (A. D. 1532) declares, that there is "ONE eternal, almighty God in essence and substance, and *not three Gods.*"

The Confession of the Waldenses states, "that the Holy Trinity is, in essence, one only true, *alone,* eternal, almighty, and incomprehensible God, of ONE equal *indivisible* essence."

The French Confession (A. D. 1566) says, "We believe and acknowledge ONE *only* God, who is ONE *only* and simple essence, spiritual, eternal, invisible, immutable, infinite," &c.

The English Confession (A. D. 1562) states, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost "be of ONE power, of ONE majesty, of ONE eternity, of ONE godhead, and ONE substance. And, although these three persons be so divided that neither the Father is the Son, nor the Son is the Holy Ghost nor the Father, yet nevertheless, we believe that there is but ONE very God."

The Confession of Belgia (A. D. 1566) declares, that "there is ONE *only* and spiritual essence, which we call God, eternal, incomprehensible, invisible, immutable, infinite," &c.

The articles of the English Episcopal Church declare, that "there is but ONE living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions," &c.

The Confession of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands, revised at the Synod of Dort, (A. D. 1618, 1619,) declares, "We believe that there is ONE *only* and simple spiritual Being, which we call God; and that he is eternal, incomprehensible, invisible, immutable, infinite," &c. (See Harmony of Confessions.)

With these agrees the Westminster Confession, approved by the General Assembly of Divines in A. D. 1647, adopted by all the Presbyterian Churches in Great Britain and America, and assented to by a great part of the Congregational Churches in New England. Its words are, "There is but ONE *only* living and true God, who is infinite in being and perfection, a pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts, or passions, immutable, immense, eternal, incomprehensible," &c. West. Con. p. 32.

Now, is *this* the denial of the divine *unity* with which we are implicitly charged? Can Unitarians present a more complete assertion of the *divine unity,* than is presented by these symbols of different denominations of Christians, who admit the doctrine of the Trinity?

But, admitting our statement of the divine unity to be correct, you will aver, probably, that my second proposition is subversive of the first. Whether this be so, or not, is what I now propose to investigate.

The common language of the Trinitarian symbols is, "*That there are three* PERSONS *in the Godhead.*" In your comments upon this, you have all along explained the word *person,* as though it were a given point, that we use this word here, in its *ordinary* acceptation, as applied to *men.* But can you satisfy yourself that this is doing us justice? Is it not evident from Church history, that the word *person* was used, in ancient times, as a term which would express the disagreement of Christians in general with the reputed errors of the Sabellians, and others of similar sentiments, who denied the existence of any *real distinction* in the Godhead, and asserted that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were merely *attributes* of God, or the names of different ways in which he revealed himself to mankind, or of different relations which he bore to them and in which he acted? Some of the principal Fathers and Councils meant to deny the correctness of such assertions, by using the word *person* to designate some *real,* not merely nominal distinction in the Godhead—to signify that something more than a diversity of relation or action, in respect to us, was intended. They seem to me to have used the word *person*, because they supposed it to approximate nearer to expressing the existence of a *real distinction*, than any other which they could choose.[1]

We profess to use the word *person*, merely from the poverty of language — merely to designate our belief of a real distinction in the Godhead; and not to describe independent, conscious beings, possessing *separate* and *equal essences* and *perfections*. Why should we be obliged so often to explain ourselves on this point? Is there any more difficulty here, or any thing more obnoxious, than when you say, "God is angry with the wicked every day?" You defend yourself in the use of such an expression, by saying, that it is only the language of *approximation*, — *i. e.* that it is intended to describe that, in the mind of the Deity, or in his actions, which corresponds in some measure, or in some respect, to anger in men,—not that he is really affected with the passion of anger. You will permit me then to add, that we speak of *person* in the Godhead to express that which, in some respect or other, corresponds to *persons* as applied to men, — *i. e. some distinction; not* that we attach to it the meaning of three beings, with a *separate* consciousness, will, omnipotence, omniscience, &c. Where, then, is our inconsistency in this, or the absurdity of our language, provided there is a real foundation in the Scriptures, on which may rest the *fact* of a distinction that we believe to exist?

I could heartily wish, indeed, that the word *person* never had come into the symbols of the Churches, because it has been the occasion of so much unnecessary dispute and difficulty. But since it has long been in common use, it is difficult, perhaps inexpedient, or even impossible, altogether to reject it. If it must be retained, I readily concede that the use of it ought to be so explained and guarded, as not to lead Christians into erroneous ideas of the nature of God. Nor can I suppose that the great body of Christians have such ideas, or understand it to mean that which you attribute to us as believing. Then, surely, it is not the best mode of convincing your opponents, to take the word in a sense so different from that in which they understand it, and proceed to charge them with absurdities, consequent upon the *language* of their creed. It has always been a conceded point, that, in the statement of difficult subjects, or the discussion of them, terms might be used in a sense somewhat different from their ordinary import. And what can declare in a plainer manner that Trinitarians do use the word *person* in this way, as applied to the divine Being, than the agreement among them that God *is numerically one,* in essence and in attributes?

It might have been justly expected, likewise, that before they were charged with sentiments which subvert the divine Unity, the meaning of the word *person*, in the ancient records which describe its introduction into the technical language of the Church, should have been carefully investigated. One of your rules of exegesis, to which I have with all my heart assented, demands that "every *word* should be modified and explained, according to the *subject* which is discussed, according to the PURPOSES, feelings, *circumstances*, and principles of the writer." Do us the justice to apply this law of interpretation to our language, and the dispute between us about the meaning of the word *person,* is for ever at an end.

What then, you doubtless will ask, is that distinction in the Godhead which the word *person* is meant to designate? I answer, without hesitation, that I do not know. The *fact* that a distinction exists, is what we aver; the definition of that distinction is what I shall by no means attempt. By what shall I, or can I define it? What simile drawn from created objects, which are necessarily derived and dependent, can illustrate the mode of existence in that Being who is underived, independent, unchangeable, infinite, eternal? I confess myself unable to advance a single step here in explaining what the distinction is. *I receive the* FACT *that it exists, simply because I believe that the Scriptures reveal the* FACT. And if the Scriptures do reveal the fact, that there are three *persons* in the Godhead (in the sense explained) — that there is a distinction which affords ground for the appellations of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost —which lays the foundation for the application of the personal pronouns, *I, thou, he* — which renders it proper to speak of *sending and being sent*, of Christ *being with God, being in his bosom,* and other things of the like nature; and yet that the divine nature belongs to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; then it is, like every other fact revealed, to be received simply on the credit of divine revelation.

Is there any more difficulty in understanding the fact that there is a distinction in the Godhead, than there is in understanding that God possesses an underived existence? With what shall we compare such existence? All other beings are *derived;* and of course, there is no object in the universe with whose existence it can be compared. To define it, then, is beyond our reach. We can approximate towards a conception of it, merely by negatives. We deny that the divine existence has any author or cause; and, when we have done this, we have not defined it, but simply said that a certain thing *does not* belong to it. Here we must rest. The boundaries of human knowledge can never be extended beyond this.

---

[1] See Appendix.

The distinction in the Godhead, which I have now mentioned, I ought to say here, we do not, and cannot consider as a mere subject of speculation, which has little or no concern with ardent piety, or the best hopes of the Christian. We believe that some of the most interesting and endearing exhibitions of the divine character are founded upon it and connected with it; and that corresponding duties are urged upon us, and peculiar hopes excited, and consolations administered by it.

In regard to this distinction, we say, *It is not a mere distinction of attributes, of relation to us, of modes of action, or of relation between attributes and substance or essence*, so far as they are known to us. We believe the Scriptures justify us in these *negations*. But *here* we leave the subject. We undertake (at least the Trinitarians of our country with whom I am acquainted, undertake) *not* at all to describe *affirmatively* the distinction in the Godhead. When you will give me an affirmative description of *underived existence*, I may safely engage to furnish you with one of *person* in the Trinity. You do not reject the belief of self-existence, merely because you cannot *affirmatively define* it; neither do we of a distinction in the Godhead, because we cannot *affirmatively define* it.

I may ask, moreover, What is the *eternity* of God? You answer by telling me, that there never was a time when he did not exist, and never can be one when he will not exist. True; but then, what was *time* before the planetary system, which measures it, had an existence? And what will *time* be when these heavens and this earth shall be blotted out? Besides, passing over this difficulty about time, you have only given a negative description of God's eternity; you *deny* certain things of him, and then aver that he is *eternal*. Yet, because you cannot affirmatively describe eternity, you would not refuse to believe that God is *eternal*. Why, then, should I reject the belief of a distinction in the Godhead, because I cannot affirmatively define it?

I do not admit, therefore, that we are exposed justly to be taxed with mysticism and absurdity when we aver there is a distinction in the Godhead, which we are utterly unable to define. I am aware, indeed, that a writer, some time since, composed and published, in a periodical work, then edited at Cambridge, a piece in which he laboured, with no small degree of acuteness, to shew that no man can believe a proposition, the terms of which are unintelligible or which he does not understand. His object in doing this appears to have been to fix upon a belief in a doctrine of the Trinity the charge of absurdity. But, it seems to me, the whole argument of that piece is founded on a confusion of two things, which are in themselves very diverse,—namely, *terms* which are *unintelligible*, and *things* which are *undefinable*. You believe in the *fact*, that the divine existence is without cause; you understand the *fact*, that God exists uncaused; but you cannot define underived existence. I believe, on the authority of the Scriptures, that there is a real distinction in the Godhead; but I cannot define it. Still the proposition that there is a *real distinction*, is just as intelligible as the one, that God is self-existent. A multitude of propositions, respecting diverse subjects, resemble these. We affirm, that gravitation brings a body thrown into the air down to the earth. The *fact* is perfectly intelligible. The terms are perfectly understood, so far as they are the means of describing this fact. But, then, what is gravitation? An affirmative definition cannot be given, which is not a mere exchange of synonymes. Nor can any comparison define it: for to what shall we liken it?

The mind of every man who is accustomed to think will supply him with a multitude of propositions of this nature; in all of which, the *fact* designed to be described is clear. The terms, so far as they describe this fact, are clear; but the *subject* of the proposition,—that is, the thing itself, or agent, concerning which the fact is asserted,—is undefinable; and, *excepting in regard to the fact in question*, perhaps wholly unknown to us.

How easy now to perplex common minds, by calling a *proposition unintelligible*, the *subject* of which is *undefinable!* In confounding things so very different, consists, as I apprehend, the whole ingenuity of the piece in question,—an ingenuity which may excite the admiration of those who love the subtilties of dispute, but cannot contribute much to illuminate the path of theological science.

I have been thus particular in my statement of this very difficult part of the subject, in order to prevent misapprehension. I certainly do not hold myself bound to vindicate any of the *definitions* of *person* or of *distinction* in the Godhead which I have seen, because I do not adopt them. I do not and cannot understand them; and to a definition I cannot with propriety assent, (still less can I undertake to defend it,) until I do understand what it signifies. It is truly matter of regret that some great and good men have carried their speculations on this subject to such a length, that they have bewildered themselves and their readers. I would always speak with respect and tenderness of such men. Still I have no hesitation in saying, that my mind is absolutely unable to elicit any distinct and certain ideas from any of the definitions of *person* in the Godhead which I have ever examined. A few examples of attempts at definition or illustration will vindicate the correctness of what I have just said.

Let me begin with Tertullian, who flourished about A. D. 200.

In his book against Praxeas, he says, "This perversity (namely, of Praxeas) thinks itself to be in possession of pure truth, while it supposes that we are to believe in one God, not otherwise than if we make the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the self same; as if all were not *one*, while all are of one, namely, *by a unity of substance;* and still the mysterious economy which distributes unity into a Trinity is observed, marking out [distinguishing] Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. There are three, not in condition, but rank; not in essence, but form; not in power, but in kind; but of *one substance, one condition, and one power;* for there is *one* God, from whom all those ranks, and forms, and kinds by the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are reckoned."

A little farther on he says, "Whatever therefore the substance of the word (*Logos*) is, I call him a PERSON, and pay him reverence; and, acknowledging the Son, I maintain that he is *second* from the Father.

"The *third* is the Spirit from God and the Son, as the fruit from the stalk is the third from the root; a stream from the river, [the third] from the fountain; the sharp point from a ray [the third] from the sun. So the Trinity proceeds, by interlinked and connected grades, from the Father."

In cap. 9, he says, "They (the Trinity) are not separate from each other, although the Father is said to be diverse from the Son and the Spirit."

And again, "We are baptized into the persons (of the Trinity) severally by the use of their several names."

It is proper to observe here how plainly and definitely the words *person* and *Trinity* are, at this very early age, applied by Tertullian to the Godhead; which contradicts the confident affirmations of some writers, that these terms were an invention of later ages, and of scholastic divinity. I may add, that the familiar and habitual use which Tertullian makes of these terms proves that they were *commonly understood*, or at least used in the Church, at a period so early, and in reference to the very distinction in the Godhead, which is the subject of the present discussion.

The object which Tertullian aims at, in predicating *person* of the Godhead, is, as has been already remarked, to oppose the sentiment of Praxeas, who denied that there existed any distinction in the divine nature. But, to explain Tertullian's similitudes, designed to illustrate the nature of this distinction, and so frequently copied in after ages, is more than I shall undertake. Who does not see that all similitudes drawn from created, limited, dependent beings or things, must be utterly inadequate to illustrate the mode in which an uncreated, infinite, and omnipresent Being exists? What is the attempt at explanation, but "darkening words without knowledge?" I believe, with Tertullian, in a threefold distinction of the Godhead; but I believe simply *the fact of the Trinity*, and do not venture to make any attempt at explanation.

The venerable Council of Nice, held A. D. 325, have made an attempt, similar to that of the Father just named, at definition or description. Their words are—"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only begotten of the Father, that is, of the substance of the Father; God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of the same substance with the Father, by whom all things were made."

This Council, like the great body of the ancient Fathers, believed in the doctrine of the *eternal generation* of the Son. This generation from all eternity appears to have been the distinctive point of difference between the Son and the Father (whom the ancient ecclesiastical writers often describe as *αγεννητος unbegotten,)* on which they fixed their attention, and which they have plainly laboured in their Creed to describe or illustrate. As *co-eternal* with the Father, they regarded the Son,—of the *same substance*, they have asserted him to be. How then could he be begotten, or derived, if he were of the same substance and of the same eternity? To hold fast both these ideas, they said the Son was "God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of the same substance with the Father." They endeavoured to justify such expressions, by saying, that the light of the sun is coeval with it, and of the same substance; and by a multitude of similes of such a nature, drawn from created and material objects. How utterly incompetent all this must be to effect the object intended, is easy of apprehension, when we once reflect that the divine nature is self-existent, independent, and immutable.

The true occasion, however, why the Nicene Fathers accumulated so many terms in their creed, must be found in their intention to oppose every form and species of Arianism, although they meant to strike, as has been before observed, at other opinions which they disapproved. A slight consideration of the Nicene Creed might lead one, perhaps, to suppose, that undefinable or objectionable terms of illustration had been, almost intentionally, accumulated in it. The history of the introduction of these terms, however, may be found in the manner in which the Arians disputed with the Nicene Fathers. "Being asked, whether they acknowledged the Son as begotten of the Father, they assented,—meaning that they acknowledged the derived existence of the Son from God, as well as that of all other beings. Did they acknowledge the Son as God?—Altogether so. Did they acknowledge him as the *true* God? Undoubtedly: he must be the true God, who is constituted God. Was the Son of God a creature?—By no means (meaning not a creature in the sense that other things were; these being *mediately* created by the Logos, but the Logos *immediately* by the Father.) But when the word ὀμοουσιος (*omousios, i. e.* the same in substance) was proposed, and it was decided that Christ was *consubstantial* with the Father, they never assented to this, as it excluded all hope of evasion."—(Athan. Epis. ad Afric.) A sober inquirer may therefore find, perhaps, more reason to vindicate this term, (so much agitated in the churches,) as used by the Nicene Fathers, than he might at first suspect.

After all, I am unable to conceive of any definite meaning in the phrase, *eternal generation. Generation* or *production*, like *creation*, necessarily implies in itself *beginning*, and of course contradicts the idea of absolute eternity. In so far as Christ is divine, *consubstantial* with the Father, he must, for ought that I can see, be necessarily regarded as self-existent, independent, and eternal. A being to whom these attributes do not belong, can never be regarded as God, except he be called so by a figurative use of the term. The *generation* or *production* of the Son of God, as *divine*, as *really and truly God*, seems to be out of the question, therefore, unless it be an express doctrine of revelation; which is so far from being the case, that I conceive the contrary is plainly taught. If the phrase *eternal generation*, then, is to be vindicated, it is only on the ground that it is figuratively used, to describe an indefinable connection and discrimination between Father and Son, which is from everlasting. It is not well chosen, however, for this purpose, because it necessarily, even in its figurative use, carries along with it an idea which is at variance with the self-existence and independence of Christ, as divine; and of course, in so far as it does this, it seems to detract from his real divinity.

I cannot therefore understand what "God of God, light of light, very God of very God," means; nor can I think that any definite and positive ideas ever were or could be attached to these phrases. That the Nicene Fathers meant to contradict Arius, is sufficiently plain to any one conversant with the history of the Council of Nice. But, that they have made out a positive, or affirmative and intelligible definition of the distinction between Father and Son, I presume no one, at the present day, will hardly venture to assert.

The Council of Constantinople, (A. D. 381,) in their Synodic Epistle to the western Bishops, have shewn the manner in which the doctrine of the Trinity was stated and defended in their day. They adopted and enlarged the Nicene symbol, so as to strike at the opinions of Macedonius; and then, in their Synodic Letter, gave the sum of what they had done or what they believed. My objection to their language is, that it is too affirmative. "Three most perfect hypostases, or three perfect persons," though aimed to contradict Sabellius, Paul of Samosata, and others of like sentiments, is an attempt to define too far. *Hypostases*, or *persons*, in the sense of *distinction* in the Godhead, may be admissible through the penury of language. But most *perfect hypostases*, *perfect persons*, is attempting to make the *distinction* more a matter of definition than it can be made. I believe that what they designed to assert is substantially true; but I cannot adopt, because I cannot regard as intelligible, all their language.

Let us leave antiquity now, and glance for a moment at some of the similar attempts at definition or illustration in modern times. The celebrated Leibnitz was requested by Loefler, who had undertaken to refute the writings of a certain English Anti-trinitarian, to give him an affirmative definition of the persons in the Godhead. He sent for answer the following,—"Several persons in an absolute substance numerically the same, signify several, particular, intelligent substances essentially related." On farther consideration, he abandoned this, and sent a second; which was, "Several persons, in an absolute substance numerically the same, mean relative, incommunicable modes of subsisting."

If Leibnitz actually understood this, I believe he must have been a better master of metaphysics than any person who has ever read his definition. In fact, he does not himself appear to have been satisfied with it; for, not long after, he wrote as follows,—"We must say, that there are *relations* in the divine substance, which distinguish the *persons*, since these persons cannot be absolute substances. But we must aver, too, that these relations are substantial. At least, we must say that the divine persons are not the same concrete, under different denominations or relations; as a man may be, at the same time, both a poet and an orator. We must say, moreover, that the three persons are not as absolute substances as the whole."[2]

This is somewhat better than either of his former attempts, inasmuch as it is confined principally to description of a negative kind. Yet, after all, I obtain by it no additional light upon the subject, which is important.

With quite as little success did that original genius and masterly reasoner, the celebrated Toellner of Frankfort, labour to define the subject in question.

---

[2] Remarques sur le livre d'un Antitrinitaire Anglois, p. 26.

"It is certain," says he, "that we must conceive, as co-existing in God, three eternal and really different actions, the action of activity, of idea, and of the desire of all possible good within and without him.

"Three really different actions, co-existing from eternity, necessarily presuppose three really different and operative substrata. It is thus, through the aid of reason illuminated by the Scriptures, we come to know, that the power, the understanding, and the will of God, are not merely three faculties, but three distinct energies, that is, three substances."[3]

Tertullian's explication, or the Nicene Creed, is at least as intelligible to me as this.

I have not produced these instances, in order to satisfy you that all attempts of this nature are and must be fruitless. You doubtless need no such proof. I have produced them for two reasons:—*the first*, to justify myself, in some measure, for not attempting a definition, in which no one has yet succeeded; *the second*, to shew that, notwithstanding all the fruitless attempts at definition which have been made, and notwithstanding the variety of method in which men have chosen to make these attempts, yet *for substance*, there is a far greater unanimity of opinion among Trinitarians than you and your friends *seem* to be willing to concede. I grant freely, that there is a great variety in the mode by which an attempt at definition or illustration is made. With my present views, I can never look upon any attempts of this nature but with regret. But I am very far from accusing them generally of any ill design,—much less can I treat them with contempt.

Patient investigation and candour will lead one to believe, as it seems to me, that the *thing aimed at was, in substance, to assert the idea of a distinction in the Godhead.* To do this with the more success, as they imagined, they endeavoured to describe *affirmatively* the nature of that distinction. Here they have all failed. But does this prove, that there is actually a great variety of opinion among Trinitarians, in regard to the principal thing concerned, merely because endeavours to define this thing have produced a great variety of illustration? I cannot help feeling that this matter is sometimes misrepresented, and very generally but little understood.

And now, can you, by arguing *à priori*, prove to me that the doctrine of the Trinity is inconsistent with itself, or "subversive of the doctrine of the divine unity," and therefore untrue? We say the divine essence and attributes are *numerically one*, so far as they are known to us, but that there is in the Godhead a *real distinction* between the Father and the Son. (I omit the consideration of the Holy Spirit here, because your sermon merely hints at this subject, and because all difficulties, in respect to the doctrine of the Trinity, are essentially connected with proving or disproving the divinity of Christ.) *We abjure all attempts to define that distinction—we admit it simply as a fact, on the authority of divine revelation.* Now, how can you prove that a distinction does *not* exist in the Godhead? I acknowledge that the want of evidence, in the Scriptures, to establish the fact, would be a sufficient reason for rejecting it. But we are now making out a statement of the subject, and answering objections that are urged *à priori*, or independently of the Scriptures. The proof, which the New Testament exhibits, we are hereafter to examine. How then, I repeat it, are you to shew that we believe in a self-contradiction, or in an impossibility? If the distinction in question cannot be *proved*, independently of the Scriptures, (and most freely I acknowledge it cannot,) it is equally certain that it cannot in this manner be *disproved.* In order to prove that this distinction contradicts the divine unity, must you not be able to tell what it is, and what the divine unity is? Can you do either?

Allow me for a moment to dwell on the subject now casually introduced. It is a clear point, I think, that the unity of God cannot be proved without revelation. It may perhaps be rendered faintly probable. Then you depend on Scripture proof for the establishment of this doctrine. But have the Scriptures anywhere told us what the *divine unity* is? Will you produce the passage? The *oneness* of God they assert: but this they assert always, *in opposition to the idols of the Heathen*—the *polytheism* of the Gentiles—the gods superior and inferior, which they worshipped. In no other sense have the Scriptures defined the ONENESS of the Deity. What, then, is *oneness*, in the uncreated, infinite, and eternal Being? In created and finite objects we have a distinct perception of what we mean by it; but can *created* objects be just and adequate representatives of the *uncreated* ONE? Familiar as the assertion is, in your conversation and in your sermons, that God is ONE, can you give me any definition of this *oneness*, except a negative one? That is, you deny plurality of it. You say God is but one, and not two or more. Still, in what, I ask, does the divine unity consist? Has not God different and various faculties and powers? Is he not almighty, omniscient, omnipresent, holy, just, and good? Does he not act differently, *i. e.* variously, in the natural and in the moral world? Does his unity consist, then, appropriately in his essence? But what is the essence of God? And how can you assert that his unity consists appropriately in this, unless you know what his essence is, and whether oneness can be any better predicated of this than of his attributes?

Your answer to all this is—"The nature of

---

[3] Vermisch. Aufsätze. B. I. p. 81.

God is beyond my reach: I cannot define it. I approach to a definition of the divine unity only by negatives." That is, you deny the numerical plurality of God, or you say, there are not two or more essences, omnisciences, omnipotences, &c.: But here all investigation is at an end. Is it possible to shew what constitutes the *internal nature* of the divine essence or attributes, or how they are related to each other, or what internal distinctions exist? About all this, revelation says not one word—certainly the book of Nature gives no instructions concerning it. The assertion, then, that God is *one*, can never be fairly understood as meaning any thing more than that he is *numerically one*,—that is, it simply denies polytheism, and never can reach beyond this. But how does this prove, or how can it prove, that there may not be, or that there are not distinctions in the Godhead, either in regard to attributes or essence, the nature of which is unknown to us, and the existence of which is to be proved by the authority of the Scriptures only?

When Unitarians, therefore, inquire what that distinction in the Godhead is in which we believe; we answer, that we do not profess to understand *what* it is: we do not undertake to define it *affirmatively*. We can approximate to a definition of it only by negatives. We deny that the Father is in *all* respects the same as the Son; and that the Holy Spirit is in *all* respects the same as either the Father or the Son. We rest the *fact*, that a distinction exists, solely upon the basis of revelation.

In principle, then, what more difficulty lies in the way of believing in a threefold distinction of the Godhead, than in believing in the divine unity?

I am certainly willing to allow, that the evidences of the divine unity in the New Testament are sufficient. But I may be permitted to suggest here, that, in my view, *the passages asserting it are fewer in number, than the passages which assert or imply that Christ is truly divine.* I cannot but think that the frequent assertions of your sermon, and of Unitarians in general, with regard to this subject, are very erroneous; that they are made at hazard, and without a diligent and faithful comparison of the number of texts that respect the divine unity in the New Testament, and the number of those which concern the divinity of the Saviour. After all, to what purpose is it, that so great a multitude of texts should be required to prove the divinity of Christ, by those who believe, as you do, that the decisions of the Scriptures are of divine authority? The decision of one text fairly made out by the laws of exegesis, is as authoritative as that of a thousand. Would a law a thousand times repeated have any more *authority* attached to it for the repetition? It might be better explained by the repetition in different connections; but its *authority* is uniformly the same.

But to return from this digression, suppose I should affirm that two subjects, A and B, are *numerically* identical in regard to something called X, but diverse or distinct in regard to something else called Y; is there any absurdity or contradiction in this affirmation? I hope I shall not, by making this supposition, be subjected to the imputation of endeavouring to prove the doctrine of the Trinity by the science of Algebra; for my only object in proposing this statement, is to illustrate the answer that we make to a very common question which Unitarians put us—"How can three be one, and one three?"—In no way, I necessarily and cheerfully reply. "How, then, is the doctrine of the Trinity in unity to be vindicated?"—In a manner which is not at all embarrassed by these questions. *We do not maintain that the Godhead is three in the same respects that it is one*, but the *reverse.* In regard to X, we maintain its numerical unity; in regard to Y, we maintain a threefold distinction. I repeat it; *We maintain simply the fact, that there is such a distinction on Scripture authority.* We do not profess to understand in what it consists.

Will you not concede, now, provided the statements made above are correct, that we are not very unreasonable, when we complain, that from the time in which Tertullian maintained the doctrine of the Trinity against Praxeas, down to the present period, the views and statements of Trinitarians, in regard to this subject, should have been so frequently misunderstood or misrepresented?

I have dwelt sufficiently on my statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the difficulties that lie in the way of proving this statement to be erroneous or contradictory. Before I proceed to the next topic, I will merely mention, in a brief way, two of the most formidable objections to our views which I have seen, and which were adduced by two men, who must be reckoned among the most intelligent that have embraced the cause of Unitarianism. The first is from Faustus Socinus, and runs thus,—

"No one is so stupid as not to see that these things are contradictory,—that our God, the Creator of heaven and earth, should be *one only* in number, and yet be three, each of which is our God. For as to what they affirm, that our God is one in number, in respect to his essence, but threefold in regard to persons; here again they affirm things which are self-contradictory, since two or three persons cannot exist, where there is numerically only one individual essence; for to constitute more than one person, more than one individual essence is required. For what is person, but a certain individual intelligent essence? Or, in what way, I pray, does one person differ from another, unless by the diversity of his individual or numerical essence? This implies, that the divine essence is numerically *one* only, yet that there is more than one person; although the divine essence which is numerically one, and divine person, are altogether identical." (Op. tom. i. p. 697.)

Here, however, it is obvious that the whole weight of the objection lies in an erroneous use of the word *person* and *essence*. Socinus attaches to them a sense which Trinitarians do not admit. How then can Trinitarians be charged with inconsistencies, in propositions which they do not make?

Of the same tenor with the objection of Socinus, is the objection mentioned by the famous Toellner (Theolog. Untersuchungen, B. I. p. 29,) which, to save room, I shall merely translate, without subjoining the original.

"The most considerable objection (against the doctrine of the Trinity) is this," says he, "that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are each a particular substance, endowed with understanding; and at the same time, neither of them is said to have his separate being, his separate understanding, his separate will, his separate power of action; but all three together have only one being, one understanding, one will, one power of action. As it appears, then, it is affirmed that there are three real beings, truly separate; each consequently having his own individual power of action, and not having it; three *separate* persons, and three persons *not separate*."

All the difficulty which this masterly writer has, in his usual way, so strikingly portrayed, lies merely in the representations of those Trinitarians, who have expressed themselves on this subject so incautiously, as to be understood to affirm that there are three separate beings (persons in the *common* sense of the word,) in the Godhead, with distinct powers, volitions, &c. If there be any now, who defend such a statement of this subject, I must leave them to compose the difficulty with Toellner as they can. The view of the doctrine of the Trinity given by Toellner, in his statement of the objection, is not that which I have presented, or which I should ever undertake to defend. Of course it cannot be adduced as an objection against the statement which I have given, and have undertaken to defend.

The second objection appears, at first sight, more formidable and perplexing. It comes from Taylor, and was inserted in the *English Theological Magazine*, vol. i. No. 4, p. 111, 1770. I have not opportunity of access to the original, and take the ideas from a Latin translation of the piece, which was published in Germany.

"There can," says Taylor, "be no real distinction between the Father and the Son, unless they so differ from each other, that what is peculiar to the Father is wanting in the Son; and what is peculiar to the Son is wanting in the Father. Now, that property which belongs exclusively to the Father, or the Son, must be numbered among the perfections of God; for in the divine nature no imperfections can exist. It follows then, that some perfection is lacking both in the Father and in the Son, so that neither is endowed with infinite perfection, which is essential to the divine nature. It must be conceded then, that the essence of the Father and the Son is not one and the same."

Ingenious and specious as this is, still I am unable to see that it settles the point in debate. The essence and attributes of God, so far as they are known to us, are *numerically one*, as we have already admitted. If by "*perfection*," Taylor means *all* which belongs to the Godhead, then I answer merely by saying, it is essential to the perfection of the Godhead, that the distinction between the Father and Son should exist; for that otherwise there would be imperfection. My right to make such a statement, is just the same as his to make the assertion, that the distinction between Father and Son involved an imperfection in each. The very distinction between Father and Son is essential to complete divinity: and, did not these exist, something would be wanting to complete the perfection of the Godhead. I acknowledge this is assumption; but so is Taylor's statement; and an argument which is built on an assumption, may surely be opposed by another argument, which has the same foundation.

My object in the present Letter has been, thus far, to compare our views of the Trinity with those which you have ascribed to us; to shew that we are not exposed on account of our belief, to be justly charged with gross and palpable absurdity, or with "subverting the Unity of the Godhead," and to prove that the question, after all, whether there is a distinction in the Godhead, must be referred solely to the decision of the Scriptures.

To them I shall appeal, as soon as I have made a few remarks on the twofold nature which we ascribe to Christ. You say, (p. 11,)

> "We (Unitarians) believe in the *unity of Jesus Christ*. We believe that Jesus is one mind, one soul, one being, as truly one as we are, and equally distinct from the one God. We complain of the doctrine of the Trinity, that, not satisfied with making God three beings, it makes Jesus Christ two beings, and thus introduces infinite confusion into our conceptions of his character. This corruption of Christianity, alike repugnant to common sense, and to the general strain of Scripture, is a remarkable proof of the power of a false philosophy in disfiguring the simple truth of Jesus.

You will admit that this is expressed in terms of severity. Whether we are really deserving of it, who hold the doctrine in question, every lover of truth will permit to be brought to the test of fair examination.

I am not certain that I have rightly apprehended your meaning when you say that the twofold nature of Christ is "repugnant to *common sense*." Do you mean that common sense may determine first, independently of revelation, that the doctrine cannot be true; and then maintain the impossibility that revelation should exhibit it? If so, then we are able to decide, *a priori*, what can be revealed, and what cannot; consequently, what we may believe, and what we must disbelieve. It follows, then, that a revelation is unnecessary, or rather, that it is impossible,—at least one which shall be obligatory upon our belief; for we have only to say, that our common sense decides against the propriety or the possibility of the things said to be revealed, and then we are at liberty to reject them.

But is this the proper sphere in which *common sense* should act? Is it not true, that common sense is limited to judging of the evidences that the Bible is of divine origin and authority; to establishing the rules of exegesis common to all languages and books; and finally, to directing a fair and impartial application of those rules, to determine what the original writer of any portion of the Scriptures designed to inculcate? Having once admitted, as you have, the divine authority of the Scripture in deciding all questions, and your obligation to submit to its decision, when you can understand the meaning of it, by using the common rules of interpretation, how is it to be determined by *common sense* whether Christ has two natures or one? Common sense may investigate the language of the inspired writers, and inquire what they have said; and if, by the sound rules of interpretation, it should appear that they have ascribed two natures to Christ, or asserted that which unavoidably leads to the conclusion that he has two natures, then either it is to be believed or the authority of the writers is to be cast off. In rejecting any doctrine which the language of Scripture plainly teaches, *common sense* must cast off the divine authority of the Bible. To receive the Bible as a revelation from God, and yet to decide, *a priori*, what the Scriptures can and what they cannot contain, and to make their language bend until it conform with this decision, cannot surely be a proper part for a sincere lover of truth and sober investigation.

In saying, then, that the doctrine which teaches that Christ has two natures, is "repugnant to common sense," I presume you must mean, that the rules of exegesis, applied by common sense, lead unavoidably to the conclusion that Christ has but one nature. If this be your meaning, what I have to say in reply will be contained in my next Letter.

In regard to the impossibility that Christ possesses two natures, and the absurdity of such a supposition, I have not much to say. If the Scriptures are the word of God, and do contain the doctrine in question, it is neither impossible nor absurd. Most certainly, if it be a fact that Christ possesses two natures, it is a fact with which natural religion has no concern; at least, of which it has no knowledge. It can therefore decide neither for nor against it. It is purely a doctrine of revelation; and to Scripture only can we look for evidences of it. If the doctrine be palpably absurd and contradictory to reason, and yet it is found in the Bible, then reject the claims of the Bible to inspiration and truth. But if the laws of interpretation do not permit us to avoid the conclusion that it is found there, we cannot with any consistency admit that the Scriptures are of divine authority, and yet reject the doctrine.

How shall any man decide *a priori*, that the doctrine cannot be true? Can we limit the omniscient and omnipotent God, by saying that the Son cannot be so united with human nature, so "become flesh and dwell among us," that we recognize and distinguish, in this complex being, but one person, and therefore speak of but one? If you ask me how such a union can be effected between natures so infinitely diverse as the divine and human, I answer, (as in the case of the distinction in the Godhead,) I do not know *how* this is done; *I do not undertake to define wherein that union consists, nor how it is effected.* God cannot divest himself of his essential perfections,—that is, he is immutably perfect; nor could the human nature of Christ have continued to be human nature, if it had ceased to be subject to the infirmities, and sorrows, and affections of this nature, while he dwelt among men. In whatever way, then, the union of the two natures was effected, it neither destroyed nor essentially changed either the divine or human nature.

Hence, at one time, Christ is represented as the Creator of the universe; and at another, as a man of sorrows, and of imperfect knowledge. (John, i. 1—18; Hebrews, i. 10—12; Luke, xxii. 44, 45; ii. 52.) If both these accounts are true, he must, as it seems to me, be God omniscient and omnipotent; and still a feeble man and of imperfect knowledge. It is, indeed, impossible to reconcile these two things without the supposition of two natures. The simple question then is, Can they be joined or united, so that, in speaking of them, we may say the person is God or man; or we may call him by one single name, and by this understand, as designated, either or both of these natures? On this subject the religion of nature says nothing. Reason has nothing to say; for surely no finite being is competent to decide that the junction of the two natures is impossible or absurd.

One person, in the sense in which each of us is one, Christ could not be. If you make God the soul, and Jesus of Nazareth the body of Christ, then you take away his human nature, and deny the imperfection of his knowledge. But may not God have been, in a manner altogether peculiar and mysterious, united to Jesus, without displaying at once his whole power in him, or necessarily rendering him supremely perfect? In the act of creation, God does not put forth all his power—nor in preservation, nor in sanctification; nor does he bring all his knowledge into action when he inspires prophets and apostles. Was it necessary that he should exert it all when in conjunction with the human nature of Christ? In governing the world from day to day, God does not surely exhaust his omnipotence or his wisdom. He employs only so much as is necessary to accomplish the design which he has in view. In his union with Jesus of Nazareth, the divine *Logos* could not, of course, be necessitated at once to put forth all his energy, or exhibit all his knowledge and wisdom. Just so much of it, and no more, was manifested as was requisite to constitute the character of an all-sufficient incarnate Mediator and Redeemer. When necessary, power and authority infinitely above human were displayed; when otherwise, the human nature sympathized and suffered like that of other men.

Is this impossible for God? Is there any thing in such a doctrine which, if found in the Bible, would afford an adequate reason for rejecting its claims to inspiration? For my own part, I cannot see the impossibility or the absurdity of such a thing. How shall we limit the Deity as to the ways in which he is to reveal himself to his creatures?

Can we not find mystery within ourselves which is as inexplicable as any thing in the doctrine before us? We do not appropriate the affections of our minds to our bodies, nor those of our bodies to our minds: each class of affections is separate and distinct. Yet we refer either to the whole man. Abraham was mortal; Abraham was immortal; are both equally true? He had an immortal and a mortal part; yet both made but *one person*. How is it a greater mystery if I say, Christ was God, and Christ was man? He had a nature human and divine. One person, indeed, in the sense in which Abraham was, he is not. Nor is there any created object to which the union of Godhead with humanity can be compared. But shall we deny the possibility of it on this account? Or shall we tax with absurdity that which it is utterly beyond our reach to scan? I shrink from such an undertaking, and place myself in the attitude of listening to what the voice of revelation may dictate in regard to this. It *becomes* us here to do so—to prostrate ourselves before the Father of Lights, and say, "Speak, Lord, for thy servants hear. Lord, what wilt thou have us to believe?"

You may, indeed, find fault with us that we speak of *three persons* in the Godhead where there is but *one nature;* and yet of but *one person* in Christ where there are *two natures*. I admit that it is an apparent inconsistency in the use of language; and cannot but wish that it had not originally been adopted. Still it is capable of some explanation. In the first case, *person* simply designates the idea that there is some *real* distinction in the Godhead, in opposition to the opinion that it is merely *nominal*. In the second, it designates Christ as he appears to us in the New Testament, clothed with a human body, and yet acting (as we suppose) not only as possessing the attributes of a man, but as also possessing divine power. We see the attributes of human nature in such intimate conjunction with those of the divine, that we cannot separate the agents; at least, we know not where to draw the line of separation, because we do not know the manner in which the union is effected or continued. We speak therefore of one *person*—that is, one agent. And when we say that the two natures of Christ are united in one person, we mean to say, that divinity and humanity are brought into such a connection in this case, that we cannot separate them, so as to make two entirely distinct and separate agents.

The present generation of Trinitarians, however, do not feel responsible for the introduction of such technical terms, in senses so diverse from the common ideas attached to them. They merely take them as they find them. For my own part, I have no attachment to them; I think them injudiciously chosen; and heartily wish they were by general consent entirely exploded. They serve, perhaps, in most cases, principally to keep up the form of words without definite ideas; and I fear they have been the occasion of many disputes in the Church. The *things* which are aimed at by these terms, I would strenuously retain; because I believe in the divine origin and authority of the Bible; and that its language, fairly interpreted, does inculcate these things. And candour, on your part, will certainly admit, that *things only* are worth any dispute. Logomachy is too trifling for a lover of truth.

LETTER III.

Reverend and dear Sir,

My great object, hitherto, has been to shew that the real question at issue between us, in regard to a distinction in the Godhead and the divinity of the Saviour, cannot be decided independently of the Scriptures. There is no such absurdity or inconsistency in either of these doctrines, as will justify us in rejecting them without investigation. The question whether they are true or not, belongs *entirely* and *purely* to revelation. If you admit this, then the simple question between us is, what does revelation teach? We are agreed that the Bible is the word of God; that whatever "Christ taught either during his personal ministry or by his inspired Apostles, is of divine authority." We are agreed as to *principles* of interpretation, in most things that are of importance. We both concede, that the principles by which all books are to be interpreted, are those which apply to the interpretation of the Bible; for the very plain reason which you have given, that when God condescends to speak and write for men, it is according to the established rules of human language. What better than an enigma would the Scriptures be, if such were not the fact? An *inspired interpreter* would be as necessary to explain, as an inspired prophet or apostle was to compose, the books of Scripture.

From this great and fundamental principle of the scriptural writings, namely, that they are composed agreeably to the common laws of human language, it results, that the grammatical analysis of the words of any passage, that is, an investigation of their usual and general meaning, of their syntactical connection, of their idiom, and of their relation to the context, must be the essential process, in determining the sense of any text or part of Scripture. On this fundamental process depends the interpretation of all the classics, and of all other books. In conformity to this process, rules of interpretation are prescribed, which cannot be violated without at once plunging into the dark and boundless field of conjectural exegesis. I may obtain aid from many sources, to throw light upon the meaning of words and sentences. From a knowledge of the geography of any country—of its climate, soil, productions, mountains, rivers, and other natural objects, as well as of the manners, customs, laws, history, &c. of its inhabitants—I may obtain assistance to explain its language, and must obtain it, if I mean to make out a satisfactory interpretation. But I can never dispense with the laws of grammatical analysis. These laws are vindicated by the simple fact, that every writer wishes and expects to be understood by his contemporaries, and therefore may be expected to use language as they do. We presume this of the sacred writers; and therefore apply to their productions, as to those of classic authors, the common rules of grammatical interpretation.

Admitting these rules to be the best and surest guide to the meaning of language, we cannot supersede them by *supposing*, or *conjecturing*, peculiarities in a writer. It is only when these peculiarities are proved, or at least rendered probable, that they can be admitted to influence our interpretation of any passage. Without such proof, we cannot violate the obvious principles of grammatical interpretation, for the sake of vindicating from inconsistency, absurdity, or contradiction, any author, even a scriptural one.

I must here explain myself, however, in order to prevent mistake in regard to my meaning. The Scriptures certainly stand on different ground from that on which any other book rests, on account of their claim to be received as a revelation from God. What other book can plead well-authenticated miracles for its support? or can produce declarations of a prophetic nature that have been fulfilled? or can glory in such an exhibition of the principles of piety and virtue, of love to God, and of benevolence and beneficence to men? Just in proportion, then, as these evidences influence my mind to believe that the Bible is of divine origin, in the same proportion it becomes improbable to me that this Bible contains absurdities, errors, or contradictions. When any *apparent* error or contradiction attracts my attention, I hesitate to pronounce it such as it appears to be. My reason for doing so is the strength of the evidence in favour of its divine origin; which is such, that I must do violence to my convictions, if I admit that the book contains either what is erroneous or contradictory. I am, then, slow to attribute, in any case, such a sense to words in the Scriptures, as would make a passage speak either absurdity or contradiction. But if, after all the light which I could gain, it should appear still to be a *plain case*, that there is either absurdity or contradiction in the sacred text; then I must find a different reading, or give up the passage, or renounce the whole book. I may suspend an opinion, while I live, as to *doubtful* cases. My convictions respecting the nature and design of the Holy Scriptures, the imperfection of my knowledge, diffidence in myself, all *demand* that I should act in this manner. But in any *clear* case, where the meaning of a sacred writer, or what he originally designed to say, can be *definitely* ascertained by the common laws of interpretation,—and it appears plainly that this meaning is erroneous, or contradicts some other passage,—I have no right to put a constructive sense upon the words, and do violence to the passage, in order to avoid the consequences that may follow. I cannot honestly do it. The same common sense and reason which prescribe the laws of exegesis, decide that the meaning of a writer must be that which those laws determine it to be. Of course, if I put a gloss upon any passage, which represents it as conveying a meaning different from that which the laws of interpretation would assign to it, I may deceive others, or I may serve the interests of party;

but I violate the reason which God has given me by so doing, and act a part dishonest, and unworthy of an inquirer after truth.

If the fundamental maxims of exegesis lead to the belief that a writer of the New Testament has contradicted himself, or another sacred writer, then I must revert at once to the question, Is the book divine? Can it be so, if there is contradiction? This question I may settle (on my responsibility to God) as I please. But I have no right to violate the fundamental rules of language, by forcing a meaning upon the writer to make him consistent; which, it is obvious, on the universal principles of explaining language, he never designed to convey. In determining the question, whether the writers of the New Testament were inspired, I must always, in attending to the internal evidence of the books, consider whether they have contradicted each other. To determine this question, I cannot violate the simple rules of grammatical exegesis. I must read this book, as I do all other books. Then, if there evidently be contradiction, I must reject its claims; if there be not, and I think the evidence is sufficient that they are well-founded, I must admit them. But, at any period subsequent to this, when I have admitted the book to be inspired, I am not at liberty to aver that the writers could never have taught some particular doctrine which I may dislike; and therefore to do violence to the rules of grammatical interpretation, in order to explain away a doctrine of this nature, which they seem to inculcate. My simple inquiry must be, what sentiment does the language of this or that passage convey, without violence or perversion of rule? When this question is settled *philologically*, (not *philosophically*,) then I either believe what is taught, or else reject the claim of divine authority. What can my own theories and reasonings about the absurdity or reasonableness of any particular doctrine avail in determining whether a writer of the New Testament *has taught* this doctrine or not? My investigation must be conducted independently of my *philosophy*, by my *philology*. And when I have obtained his meaning by the simple and universal rules of expounding language, I choose the course I will take; I must believe his assertion, or reject his authority.

If these be not sound maxims of interpretation, I confess myself a stranger to the subject; nor can I help thinking that you will accord with me at once in the views just expressed.

Guided, then, by these principles, let us now come to the investigation of a few passages in the New Testament, which concern the divine nature of Christ. I take this point, because you have dwelt most upon it; and because very obviously, when this is admitted or rejected, no possible objection can be felt to admitting or rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity.

You will not require of me, however, to examine at length every text of the New Testament, which I may suppose to have any connection with the subject in question. I must be permitted, in order to save time, to select only those texts, the language of which appears to be genuine, and above the condemnation of textual criticism; and such as appear to contain the best and most decisive proof of the point to be discussed. Believing the New Testament to be of divine origin and authority, you will permit me to add, that I cannot think the decision of this or any other question, depends on the number of times in which the terms of that decision are repeated. I observe then,

I. The New Testament gives to Christ the appellation of God, in such a manner as that, according to the fair rules of interpretation, only the SUPREME God can be meant.

A conspicuous passage in proof of this I should find in John, i. 1—3. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made." Verse 10, "And the world was made by him."

All known manuscripts agree in the text here. Griesbach has indeed recorded, that, for ὁ Θεος (Theos, God) there is a conjectural reading Θεου; and that for και Θεος ην ὁ Λογος, there is a conjectural reading of Θεος ην και ὁ Λογος. The first of these conjectures was made by Crellius. (Initium Evang. Johan. restauratum per L. M. Artemonium. P. i. c. 2.) The reason of making such a conjecture Crellius has given.

"The greater Christ is," says he, "compared with other gods (the Father excepted,) the less can he be expressly called God, *lest he should be taken for the supreme God the Father*." And again, "If he (Christ) had been expressly called God by the sacred writers, and had not always been distinguished from God, *the sacred writers would have given an occasion to unskilful men to regard him as the supreme God*." (Init. Evang. Johan. p. 295.)

To liberate John from being taxed with this imprudence, Crellius proposed to substitute Θεου for Θεος, in John, i. 1; so as to say, *the Logos was of God*, instead of saying, as John has done, that *he was God*.

The second conjectural reading is supported by no better authority. Bahrdt (in Neuesten Offenbarungen) proposed it as a happy expedient to relieve the text from the difficulty and embarrassment under which he thought it laboured. For, instead of saying, "The Word was with God, and the Word was God," he might then translate it thus,—"The Word was with God. God was, and this Word was in the beginning with God," &c.

I have a great regard for the labours and learning of Griesbach; but I am constrained to ask here, why he should have condescended to notice conjectures so gratuitous and unfounded as these?

I proceed to the explanation of the text, Εν αϱχῃ (that is, in the beginning) corresponds exactly with the Hebrew—Gen. i. 1.[1] I cannot embrace the opinion of those critics, who think that the phrase εν αϱχῃ, of itself *simply*, signifies *from eternity*. Although I believe that the *Logos* did exist from eternity, I do not think it is proved *directly* by this expression, (compare Gen. i. 1.) That existence from eternity is *implied*, however, may be properly admitted. Εν αϱχῃ is equivalent to εν αϱχῃ κοσμου, *in the beginning of the world*, that is, before the world was made; and so agreeing in this particular with the phrase, John, xvii. 5, "the glory that I had with thee before the world was;" and Eph. i. 4, "before the foundation of the world." To say with Crellius, that by εν αϱχῃ is meant the *commencement* of preaching the Gospel, or the beginning of Christian instruction, would be making John gravely tell us, that, before the *Logos* preached the Gospel, he had an existence.

Before the world was created, then, the *Logos* existed. Who or what was this *Logos?* A real existence, or only an attribute of God? A real substance, or only the wisdom, or reason, or power of God?

It is of no importance in settling this question, that we should know with certainty whence John derived the appellation *Logos*. In my mind, the most probable account is, that this appellation is bestowed on Christ, in reference to his becoming the instructor or teacher of mankind—the medium of communication between God and them. Be this, however, as it may, the *Logos* appears to be a *real existence*, and not merely an *attribute*. For, *first*, The attributes of God are nowhere else *personified* by the New Testament writers, that is, the usage of the New Testament authors is against this mode of writing. *Secondly*, *Logos*, if considered as an abstract term, or as merely designating an attribute, must mean either *wisdom* or *word;* and in what intelligible sense can the *wisdom* or the *word* of God, in the abstract sense, be said to have "*become flesh and dwelt among us*," v. 14; or why should John select either the *wisdom* or *word* of God as any more concerned with the incarnation than the *benevolence of God*, or the *mercy of God*, which one might suppose would be the attributes more especially displayed in the incarnation? *Thirdly*, If *Logos* mean here the *power* of God, as many assert, the exposition is attended with the same difficulties. *Fourthly*, If it mean, as others aver, the *power of God putting itself forth*, that is, in the creation, it is liable to the same objections. In short, make it any *attribute* of God thus personified, and you introduce a mode of writing that the New Testament nowhere else displays, and which even the Old Testament exhibits but once, (Prov. viii.) in a poetic composition of the most animated and exalted nature.

Yet this is not the chief difficulty. To what class of men could John address the asseveration that the *Logos* (*wisdom, word*, or *power* of God) "was with God?"

Where did these singular heretics suppose the *power* of God was, except *with him?* Or where his *wisdom* or his *word?* A peculiar pertinacity, too, in their strange opinion, they must have had, to have rendered it necessary for the apostle to *repeat*, with emphasis, in the second verse, that this *Logos was with God*. What would be said of a man who should gravely assert that "the *power* of Peter is with Peter, or that his *wisdom* or his *word* is so?" And suppose he should add, "*the power or wisdom of Peter is Peter*," with what class of mystics should we rank him? Yet John adds, "*The Logos was God*." Until, then, some heretics of the apostolic age can be discovered who maintained that the attributes of God were not *with* him, I cannot explain how the apostle could assert twice successively, and of course emphatically, that his attributes were *with* him.

Equally difficult is it for me to divine how he could say that any attribute (*power*, or *wisdom*) *was God*—understanding the word God in any sense which you please. If it mean *supreme God*, then it reduces itself to this, either that one attribute is the supreme God, or that there are as many Gods as attributes. If it mean an *inferior* God, then the *wisdom* of God, being an *inferior* God, implies that his other attributes are *superior* Gods; or else that his wisdom holds the place of *quasi* God, while his other attributes occupy a lower place. Suppose that it should be said that *Logos* or *wisdom* denotes the essence of God, then how could it be called Θεος, which implies an agent or person—a *concrete*, as logicians say, and not an *abstract?* The divine substance or essence is called Θειοτης, or το Θειον, not ὁ Θεος. What could be meant, moreover, by the *essence* of God becoming incarnate?

If, however, it should be said, that to suppose the existence of a sect of heretics, who held that the attributes of God were *not with him*, is unnecessary in order to justify the apostle for having written the first verse of his Gospel, and that we may regard this verse as written simply for general instruction, then I would ask, whether it is probable that a revelation from heaven is made to inform us that the *attributes of a being are with that being?* or what can be thought of the assertion, that the *wisdom* or *power* of God is God himself?

---

[1] The Hebrew words are omitted in this and some other passages, because their insertion would be of little use to the general reader. The biblical student may, however, consult the original Hebrew.

Let us proceed now to the second clause, "*and the Logos was with God,*"—that is, as all agree, with God the Father. Compare verses 14 and 18; also chapter xvii. 5, and 1 John, i. 1, 2; which make the point clear. Is this expression capable of any tolerable interpretation, without supposing that the *Logos*, who was *with God*, was in some respect or other different, *or diverse from that God, with whom he was?* This *Logos* was the same that became incarnate, verse 14; that made the most perfect revelation of the will and character of God to men, verse 18; and was called *Christ*. He was therefore, *in some respect*, diverse from the Father, and therefore by no means to be confounded with him.

"*And the Logos was God.*" It has been proposed (in Impr. Vers. of N. Test.) to render the word Θεος, a *god*. Does then the Christian revelation admit of gods superior and inferior? And if so, to what class of inferior gods does the *Logos* belong? And how much would such a theory of divine natures differ from that which admits a Jupiter Optimus Maximus, and gods greater and less?

But it is said, that "Θεος is destitute of the article, and therefore cannot designate the Divine Being, who is supreme." This observation, however, is far from being justifiable, either by the usage of the sacred writers or the principles of Greek syntax. Among instances where the supreme God is certainly designated, and yet the article is omitted, the inquirer may consult the very chapter in question, ver. 6, 13, 18; also, Matt. xix. 26; Luke, xvi. 13; John, ix. 33; xvi. 30; Rom. viii. 8; 1 Cor. i. 3; Gal. i. 1; Ephes. ii. 8; Heb. ix. 14. Besides, every reader of Greek knows, that where the subject of a proposition (which in this case is ὁ Λογος) has the article, the predicate (Θεος) omits it. Such is Greek usage; and from it dissent only propositions of a reciprocating or controvertible nature,—as in verse 4 of the chapter in question. It may be added, too, that if the writer said και ὁ Λογος ην ὁ Θεος, it would have conveyed a very different sense from the proposition as it now stands. He would then have said, *the Logos is the God with whom he is;* whereas I understand Θεος here to mean *divine nature*, simply but not abstractly considered, for which it so often stands in other places. *Vide* Mark, viii. 33; x. 27; xii. 24; Luke, iii. 8; xi. 20, xviii. 4, 19; John, i. 13; iii. 2; iv. 24; x. 33; Acts, v. 29; vii. 55; x. 33; xi. 18, &c.

I readily acknowledge, that *affirmative* evidence of the somewhat diverse meaning of Θεος here, cannot be drawn from the word itself, but must be deduced from the circumstances of the affirmation, united with the supposition that John did assert, and did mean to assert, something that is intelligible. There is indeed no very serious difficulty, in taking Θεος (*God*) in the same sense in both clauses, provided we understand it to denote the Divinity. To interpret the verse thus would represent John as saying, that while Christ was God or truly divine, there was at the same time a sense in which he was *with* God. In order that this should have any possible meaning, a distinction in the Godhead must be admitted,—viz. that the Father is not in all respects the same as the Son.

For myself, I do not hesitate to understand the word *God* in a sense somewhat diverse, in the two clauses of the verse under consideration. Every word takes a sense adapted to its connection. Such is the rule which must be adopted, after we have once conceded that a writer uses words with propriety, and designs to be understood. So, when our Saviour says, "Let the dead bury their dead," the connection requires us to explain it thus, —"Let those who are morally or spiritually dead bury those who are corporeally so." It were easy to accumulate examples, where the very same word, in the very same verse, has two different shades of sense. The exigency of the passage (*exigentia loci*) is the rule of interpretation which guides us here: and, guided by this exigency, what difficulty is there in supposing that God, as Father, is meant in the first instance, and the Divinity, without reference to the peculiar distinction of *Father*, in the second?

I understand John, then, as affirming, that the *Logos* was God, and yet was with God,—namely, that he was truly divine, but still divine in such a manner that there did exist a distinction between him and the Father. I take the word *God*, in one case, to mean, as in a great number of cases it does mean, God as Father; in the other case, I regard it as a description of divine being of the Divinity, without reference to the distinction of Father, —a use which is very common.

Least of all have those a right to object to this, who here make the meaning of *God*, in the second instance, to be infinitely different from its meaning in the first instance,—understanding by the first, the self-existent, independent, and infinite God; by the second, a created or derived and finite being.

If you ask now, What could be the object of John, in asserting that *the Logos was with God?* I answer, that the phrase, *to be with one* (ἐιναι προς τινα,) indicates *conjunction, communion, familiarity, society*. See Mark, ix. 19. Compare too, John, i. 18, where the only begotten Son is said to be "in the bosom (ἐις τον κολπον) of the Father," which is a phrase of similar import.

To illustrate the meaning of the phrase *to be with God*, it is useful also to compare those cases where Christians are promised, as the summit of their felicity, that they shall *be with God* and Christ, and be where they are. See among other passages, John, xiv. 2, 3; xii. 26; xvii, 24; 1 Thess. iv. 17. Compare Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12; Coloss. iii. 1—4.

In John, xvii. 5, Christ speaks of that "glory which he had *with the Father*, before the world was." From all these passages taken together, it would seem that the phrase, *the Logos was with God*, amounts to asserting that he was (*conjunctissimus Deo*) *most intimately connected with him.* If you ask me *how*, I answer freely that I cannot tell. The Evangelist has asserted the *fact*, but has not added one word to explain the (*modus*) manner. If I could explain it, then perhaps I might define the distinction which I believe to exist in the Godhead.

But why should John assert such a connection? In opposition, I answer, to those in early times who asserted that Christ was a being not only *distinct from* God, but *an emanation from him.* The asseveration, that the *Logos was with God*, was from the beginning most intimately *connected with him*, and was *divine*, would of course contradict such an opinion.

But does the Evangelist here mean to assert of the *Logos*, that he is God in the true and supreme sense, or not? This is the fundamental question between us. Analogy, drawn from the New Testament usage of the word Θεος (which nowhere else employs this word simply and singly, except to designate the Supreme God) must be admitted strongly to favour the idea, that Christ is here asserted to be truly divine. I readily allow, that in the Old Testament, the word *God* has various applications—that it is applied (though only in the plural number) to magistrates—that it is used to designate those who, for a time, stand as it were in the place of God, as Moses was to be for a *god* to Pharaoh, Exod. vii. 1, and instead of God to Aaron, Exod. iv. 16. But it is not possible, in any instance of this nature, to mistake the meaning. The adjuncts or context always guard effectually against mistake. Men or inferior beings are never called *God*, or gods *simply*. We read of a "god to Pharaoh:" we read also, "I have said, ye are gods, *but ye shall die like men.*" The Scriptures speak of the god of Ekron, the god of the Ammonites, the gods of the Heathen, &c. Is a mistake possible here? But the *Logos* is called *God simply*. Nor is this all. Admitting that the name of itself determines nothing (and, for the sake of the argument, I am willing to admit it,) yet the writer has added explanations of his meaning, which seem to place what he intended to assert, by the expression in question, beyond the reach of fair debate.

John, i. 3. "All things were [made] by him; and without him was nothing [made] which was [made."] Verse 10. "The world was [made] by him."

I have excluded the word *made*, by placing it in brackets, merely to shew that the sense is in nowise changed by the version of those critics, who tell us that ἐγενετο never means *made*, but simply *was*. Yet nothing can be farther from correctness than such an assertion. Accordingly, ποιεω and γινομαι are used as synonymes;—as in James, iii. 9; compare Gen. i. 26, in the Septuagint; Gen. ii. 4; Isaiah, xlviii. 7. The cases where γινομαι means to *make* or *produce*, are so numerous and obvious, that a moment's delay in respect to this part of the subject would be useless. Schleusner's Lexicon, under the word γινομαι, will furnish adequate proof of this. If not, read the commentary of Theodoret on the two first chapters of Genesis, which places the question, as to the use of γινομαι, beyond debate.

But what are the "all things"—the *universe* (τα παντα)—which the *Logos* made or created? —"The moral world—the Christian Church," answers Faustus Socinus. To this exposition, however, there are two objections. *First*, a part of these τα παντα are, in verse 10, represented as (ὁ κοσμος) *the world*,—a term nowhere in the New Testament applied to the Christian Church, nor to men as morally amended by the Gospel. *Secondly*, this very *world* (ὁ κοσμος) which he created, *did not know or acknowledge him* ἀυτον ὀυκ ἐγνω: whereas the distinguishing trait of Christians is, that they *know Christ*—that they *know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent.*

Τα παντα, then, which the Logos created, means (as common usage and the exigency of the passage require,) *the universe*—the worlds material and immaterial. (Ver. 10.) Here, consequently, in the first chapter of John, is a passage in which, beyond all reasonable doubt, Christ is called *God;* and where the context, instead of furnishing us with reasons for understanding the word *God* in an inferior sense (as is usual when this designation is applied to inferior beings,) has plainly and unequivocally taught us, that this *God* (Θεος,) who was the *Logos*, *created the universe.* The question, then, is reduced to this simple state, —Is he, who created the universe, truly and properly divine? On this question I shall make a few remarks, when I have considered some other passages which ascribe the work of creation to Christ.

Heb. i. 10—12, "And thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: They shall perish, but thou remainest; and they shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail."

These words are spoken of the *Son of God;* for they are intimately connected by the conjunction *and* with ver. 8, where it is written, "But unto the *Son* he saith," &c. According to the laws of grammar, and most clearly according to the nature and design of the Apostle's argument, the ellipsis to be supplied, in the beginning of the tenth verse, after *and* (και) is, "And [*to the Son he saith,*] Thou, Lord," &c. No other exposition can be pointed out, which doth not make a violent divulsion of the passage from the connection of the writer's argument.

The question still remains, "What is meant by *founding the earth*, and by the heavens being the work of Christ's hands?" To answer the first question, and place the answer beyond the possibility of a reasonable doubt, it is necessary only to compare the passages in which Jehovah is said to have *founded the earth.* By this phrase the *creation* of it is indubitably meant. The passages may be found in Psalm xxiv. 2; lxxxix. 11; civ. 5; cxix. 90; Job, xxxvii. 4; Prov. iii. 19; Is. xlviii. 13; li. 13; Zech. xii. 1; where, if you inspect the Septuagint, you will see the very verb ϑεμελιοω (*themelio*—to found, to establish,) employed, which the Apostle uses in our text.

In regard to the "heavens being the work of Christ's hands," it is an expression plainly of similar import to the one just examined, and signifies the *creation* of the heavens. Thus, Psalm viii. 3, 6—"When I consider the heavens, *the work of thy hands;*" which is parallel with "The moon and stars which thou hast ordained," (Septuagint, ἐθεμελιωσας.) So in verse 6th, "And hast placed him over *the works of thy hands;* all things hast thou put under his feet,"—that is, placed him over the *creation.*

To prove that the phrase to *create the heavens and the earth*, means to create *all things*, it is necessary only to consult Gen. i. 1; Ex. xx. 11, xxxi. 17; Neh. ix. 6; Ps. cxxi. 2; cxxiv. 8; cxxxiv. 3; and other like passages, which a Concordance will supply.

It will be remembered, that the passage in question (Heb. i. 10—12) is a quotation from the Old Testament; and that to quote the language of the Old Testament, therefore, in order to explain it, is peculiarly appropriate and necessary.

Would any one, now, unembarrassed by a peculiarity of system, ever suspect that Christ's *founding the earth, and the heavens being the work of his hands*, could mean any thing less than the creation of the universe? Yet we have been told by some distinguished Unitarians, that the *heavens* mean the Christian state or dispensation, and *earth* the Jewish one.

But, *first*, this is against usage, either in the Old or New Testament,—there being nothing to support such a sense of it. Isaiah, indeed, speaks of *creating a* NEW *heaven and a* NEW *earth* (lxv. 17;) and of *planting the heavens and the earth* (li. 16.) in a moral sense, that is, making a moral change or creation. But then the language itself, in the first case, indicates, that the *old* creation is NOT meant; and, in the second case, the context makes it as clear what kind of heaven and earth is to be planted or established, and what the planting of them means,—namely, the Jewish Church and state is to be renewed and established. The meaning, then, assigned by some Unitarians to the passage in Heb. i. is against the plain and perpetual usage of the Scriptures, in regard to such expressions, when they occur in an *unlimited form*, as they do in the passage under examination.

Secondly, If the Jewish and the Christian states are here meant, in what sense are they to wax old as a garment, and to be changed? Of the Jewish state this might without much difficulty be affirmed. But how the Christian dispensation is to be changed — how that "kingdom which *shall have* NO *end*," (Luke, i. 33,) is to "perish," I am unable to explain.

"It is a moral creation, of which Christ is the author," says Artemonius, that is, Crellius (Init. Evang. Johan.) This, however, does not explain the matter; for how is it that the *moral creation* of Christ is to be *changed* and perish, that is, to be annihilated? Most obviously his moral creation is to be eternal.

Another method of explaining this subject has been, to aver that the passage here quoted by the apostle from Ps. cii. 25—27, is, in the original, plainly applicable to Jehovah only; and that none would conjecture, from the simple perusal of this Psalm, how Christ could be the subject of it. Conceding that the passage is applicable to Jehovah only, (and it would be difficult to shew why this is not to be conceded,) what is the consequence? Either that the apostle has directly, and without qualification, applied to Christ language used by an inspired writer of the Old Testament to designate the Creator of the world, with his eternal and immutable nature; or that he has (in a way singular indeed for a man of piety and honesty) accommodated language descriptive of the infinite Jehovah only, to a created and dependent being. Κυριος (*Lord*) in the Greek, corresponds to the word *Jehovah* in the original Hebrew, the Septuagint having commonly rendered it in this manner. And though Jehovah is not in the Hebrew text (Ps. cii. 25,) yet it is evident, from the preceding context, that it must be understood there as the subject of the verb, *thou hast founded.* Christ, then, is here called by the apostle *Jehovah;* and *eternity, immutability, and the creation of the universe,* are ascribed to him.[2]

I cannot think that the paraphrase of Grotius, on the passsage in question, deserves a serious refutation. "Thou wast the cause," says he "that the earth was founded; and on thy account the heavens were made." If this be not a different thing from what the language of the apostle naturally means, or can mean, I confess I know not any bounds which may be set to paraphrastic or mystical exegesis. Suppose now the Gnostics, who maintained that evil demons, and not Jehovah, created the world, should have paraphrased the first verse in Genesis in this manner,—"Thou, Jehovah, wast the cause why the heavens and the earth were created;" and, when asked how this could consist with their sentiments, or what they could mean by it, they should have replied, "Out of enmity to thee, the evil demons brought the material creation into existence," then they would have explained away the creative act of Jehovah, exactly as Grotius explains away the evidence that Christ was the Creator.

Col. i. 15—17. "Who is the image of the invisible God, the head of all creation; for by him were all things created, both celestial and terrestrial, visible and invisible, of whatever order or rank they are—all things were created by him and for him. Therefore he was before all things, and by him are all things sustained."

The places in which I have departed from our common version, are not differently rendered in order to make them favour the cause which I have espoused; for they determine nothing respecting the point now at issue. They are rendered as above merely to make the meaning of the passage in general as plain as the nature of the case will permit.

Because, in verse 20, Christ is said "to reconcile (ἀποκαταλλαξαι) all things unto himself," and these are said to be "things in heaven and things on earth;" and afterwards, he is represented as breaking down the wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles; some ingenious commentators have supposed that "things in heaven and things on earth," mean *Jews and Gentiles.* How very unnatural this explanation is, no one can help feeling who reads the passage in an unbiassed manner. In what tolerable sense can the Jews and Gentiles be called "things visible and invisible!" or how shall we explain the phrase, "things in heaven and things on earth," as applied to them? By "reconciling things in heaven and things on earth," seems evidently to be meant, bringing into union under one great head, that is, Christ, by a new and special bond of intercommunication, both angels and men. In like manner, the two great parties on earth, Jews and Gentiles, are united together. But why Christ should be called "the image of the invisible God," and the "head (πρωτοτοκος, *the first-born*) of all creation," because he is merely the instrument of bringing Jews and Gentiles together, is not apparent to me. Yet, to be such an instrument, is all that the passage in question ascribes to him, if we are to construe it in the manner above related. But when you understand the words of the apostle, as describing the creation of the worlds celestial and terrestrial (ὁι ὀυρανοι και ἡ γη, compare Heb. i. 10—12,) and ascribing it to Christ, then you find sufficient reason for designating him by the exalted appellations in question.

It has also been affirmed, that a *moral creation* only is here ascribed to Christ. But words like these in such a connection, and with such adjuncts, are nowhere else used in this sense. Moreover, in what sense has the *moral creation* by Christ affected the angels? The good ones needed not repentance or pardon; the bad ones have never sought or obtained either. "Verily, he did not assist the angels, (ὀυ γαρ δηπου ἀγγελων ἐπιλαμβάνεται,) but the seed of Abraham," Heb. ii. 16.

Until I see different light, therefore, shed over the passage in question, I must regard it as very clearly ascribing the creation of the universe to Christ.

But you will say, perhaps, that in John, i. 3, "All things are said to be made *by Christ,* δια Χριστου, as the *instrumental* not the *principal* cause,—the preposition δια denoting such cause. In Col. i. 16, it is also said, that all things were created *by Christ* (δἰ ἀυτου;) and in Heb. i. 2, God is said to have created the worlds *by* his Son,—Δἰ ὁυ (sc. ὑιου) και τους ἀιωνας ἐποιησε."

The allegation, however, that δια does not designate the *principal* as well as the *instrumental* cause, can by no means be supported. In Rom. xi. 36, "All things are said to be of God (εξ αυτου) and by God (δἰ αυτου,) the very form of expression applied to Christ, in Col. i. 16—20. So Heb. ii. 10, "For it became him (God the Father,) for whom, δἰ ὁυ, are all things, and by whom, δἰ ὁυ, are all things," &c. 1 Cor. i. 9, "God is faithful, by whom, δἰ ὁυ, ye were called into the fellowship of his Son," &c. Moreover, ἐκ and δια, are sometimes interchanged as equivalents or synonymes, see Rom. iii. 30. So also, ἐν and δια, Col. i. 16,—τα παντα ἐν ἀυτω ἐκτισθη, and δἰ ἀυτου ἐκισται,—that is, ἐν and δια, in these two phrases, are of the same import. See Schleusner's Lex. in voc. δια.

---

[2] I readily admit, that κυριος is not always synonymous with *Jehovah:* But where the word *Jehovah* is used in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, κυριος stands, in the Septuagint and in the New Testament, as the translation of it. Therefore κυριος, in the New Testament, must, of course, in such cases, have the same meaning as *Jehovah* in the Old Testament. The reason why κυριος is used by the New Testament writers as the translation of *Jehovah* in the Hebrew Scriptures, is, that the Jews, in reading their sacred writings, were not accustomed to pronounce the word *Jehovah,* but read, for the most part, *Lord,* κυριος, in the room of it.

The difficulty remaining is, to explain the phrase "by whom δι᾽ ὁυ he (the Father) made the worlds," (Heb. i. 2.) The apostle has added sufficient, in verses 10—12, as it might seem, to prevent mistake here. If, however, the difficulty seems still to press, it may be compared with Hos. i. 7, "I (Jehovah) will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them *by Jehovah*." Is the second Jehovah merely the *instrumental* cause in this case? Of the same nature is the phraseology in Gen. xix. 24; "and *Jehovah* rained down upon Sodom and Gomorrah fire and brimstone FROM JEHOVAH out of heaven." Must the *last Jehovah*, in this case, be a being inferior to the *first?* If not, then the phrase, that *God made the worlds by his Son*, does not imply, of course, that the Son is of an inferior nature. It does imply that there is a distinction between the Father and Son; and this is what we aver to be a Scripture doctrine. It seems to declare, also, that *the Godhead, in respect to the distinction of Son, was in a special manner concerned with the creation of the worlds.* What is there impossible or improbable in this?

From the passages of Scripture thus far considered, it appears plain that the apostles have ascribed the creation of the universe to Christ. And now we come, in order, to the consideration of the simple question, whether he who created the world is really and truly divine.

First, then, permit me to ask, If the act of creation does not prove the being who performs it to be omniscient, omnipotent, and independent, is it possible for me to conceive of any thing which does or can prove the existence of such a being? To bring this world into existence from nothing—to establish such perfect concord and design through all the operations of nature—to set in motion the unnumbered worlds and systems of worlds, and all in the most perfect harmony and order—requires more intelligence, more power, and more wisdom, than ever belonged to any finite being. And if these things do not characterize the infinite being, it seems to me no proof that such a being exists can be adduced.

It is in vain to tell me here, that the creation of the universe can be performed by *delegation*—by an inferior and subordinate being. What can be meant by omnipotence and infinite wisdom (all of which must belong to a Creator) being *delegated?* Can God *delegate* his *perfections?* If so, then the Gnostics, when pressed with the argument that Jehovah, the God of the Jews, was the Supreme God, because he created the heavens and the earth, might have replied, that he did this only by *delegated power;* and that the act of creation, therefore, proves nothing. You reply to such an allegation, that the act of creating the universe is one which no finite or secondary being can perform. If this act do not designate the absolute, supreme, omnipotent, and omniscient Being, then no proof that such a Being exists can possibly be adduced.

We use the very same arguments to confute those who maintain that Christ created the world by *delegated* power. The apostle having decided the question that Christ did create the world, has decided, consequently, that he must be *truly divine.*

Agreeably to this reasoning, the Bible every where appeals to *creative* power as the peculiar and distinguishing prerogative of the Supreme God; and attributes it solely to Jehovah. Read Gen. ii. 2, 3; Exod. xx. 11; Isaiah, xliv. 24; Jer. x. 12; Psalm viii. 3, 4; cii. 25, and other passages of the same tenor. Read Isaiah, xl. and onward, where God, by his prophet, makes a most solemn challenge to all polytheists to bring the objects of their worship into competition with him, and declares himself to be distinguished from them all by his being "the Creator of the ends of the earth," (ver. 28,) and by his having formed and arranged the heavens, (ver. 26.)

Can it be made plainer than these passages make it, that *creative power* was regarded by the Hebrew prophets as the *appropriate* and *peculiar* attribute of the Supreme God? Need I say, that the Old Testament is filled with passages which ascribe the work of creation to Jehovah alone? Who does not find them every where intermixed, in the most delightful and affecting manner, with all the instructions of the sacred Hebrew writers?

Now, if a subordinate agent, a *finite spirit*, did create the universe, why should all the instructions of the Old Testament be so framed as inevitably to lead the Jewish nation to disbelieve and reject this fact? Specially so as the Jews were strongly inclined to polytheism, and a plurality of gods would have been very agreeable to their wishes. And why, after a lapse of so many centuries, should the writers of the New Testament overturn all that the Hebrew Scriptures had taught on this subject, and lead men to admit that a *finite being* could and did create the world? Most of all, how could Paul say (Rom. i. 20,) that the Heathen were without excuse for not acknowledging the *eternal power and Godhead* of the Divinity, from the evidence which his CREATING power afforded—from considering the THINGS THAT WERE MADE?

And is this truth (that the Deity possesses eternal power and Godhead) so plain, then, and so easily deduced from CREATING ENERGY, that the very heathen are destitute of all excuse for not seeing and admitting it; and yet, can it be the object of Christianity to bring us back to the very polytheism for which the apostle condemned them—to bring us to "worship the *creature* more than the Creator?" Does Christianity contradict a truth of natural religion so plain and incontrovertible, that the very heathen were without excuse for not acknowledging it? And after reading such a passage in the writings of Paul, can it be possible to suppose, that he ascribed the creation of the world to any thing but the true God only? Compare now Acts, xvii. 23—26, with John, i. 1—3, and 10; Heb. i. 10—12; Coloss. i. 14—17; and then say, is it possible to admit the rules of interpretation which you have laid down, and not admit that the apostles designed to assert that Christ is the Creator of the Universe? And if he is so, is it possible to deny that he is *truly divine?*

It were easy to produce passages of the New Testament, which ascribe the same works to Christ as to God (as John, v. 17—23; xiv. 9, 11.) But as the vindication of these would swell these letters beyond their proper length, I shall not enter into a discussion of them at present. I am not anxious to increase the number of witnesses; for, acknowledging the New Testament to be of divine authority, I consider whatever it plainly declares once, to be the truth. The *relevancy* and *plainness* of the testimony, therefore, is more the object of my solicitude, than the *number* of witnesses,—a point, I may add, in which many, who have defended our sentiments, have greatly erred.

I shall proceed, therefore, to other texts of Scripture, in which Christ is declared to be God.

Rom. ix. 5, "Whose are the fathers; and from whom, in respect to the flesh (his human nature) Christ (descended,) who is the Supreme God, blessed for ever. Amen!"

In regard to this text, it may be remarked, *first*, that although Griesbach has filled his margin with conjectural and other readings, he attributes no considerable weight to any of them; for *all the manuscripts* of the Epistle to the Romans, which have been collated, *contain the text as it stands;* as do *all the ancient versions*, and *nearly all the* Fathers.

In rendering το κατα σαρκα, *in respect to his human nature*, I feel supported by corresponding passages, in Rom. i. 3;[3] Acts, ii. 30. And that ὁ ὢν ἐπι παντων ϑεος ἐυλογητος ἐις τους ἀιωνας, is literally translated, *who is Supreme God, blessed for ever*, may be shewn in various ways. ‛Ο ὢν is here put, as in common, (see John, i. 18; iii. 13; 2 Cor. xi. 31,) for ὁς ἐστι, *who is.* The ground of this lies simply in the nature of Greek usage. Whenever ὁ is used for ὁς, it takes the participle ὢν instead of the verb ἐστί. The Greeks say ὁ ὢν, but ὁς ἐστι.

᾿Επι παντων Θεος is literally, "*over-all God,*" that is, Supreme God. Compare with the phraseology here, the word παντα (*all,*) as used in a connection which respects Christ, in Col. i. 17; Eph. i. 19, 23; John, iii. 31; and 1 Cor. xv. 27. It is used in such passages as a term of qualification which serves to describe him as the *head* or *ruler* of the universe. What, then, can ἐπι παντων Θεος mean, but *Supreme God?*

But on no text has greater pains been bestowed, in order to devise an unusual construction and meaning.—Schlichting proposed to transpose ὁ ὢν and read ὢν ὁ, that is, *of whom* (the Jewish fathers) *is God, blessed for ever.* But as, in this very epistle, the apostle has laboured to prove that God is as well the God of the Gentiles as of the Jews (iii. 29,) this expedient would seem to impeach the apostle's consistency, as well as violate the text. Nor would the text itself, as amended by Schlichting's conjecture, be in any measure accordant with the idiom of the Greek language. If ϑεος has the article (and his transposition makes it ὁ ϑεος,) then ἐυλογητος must of necessity have it too,—inasmuch as an adjective following a noun with an article, and agreeing with it, of necessity takes the article.

Wetstein's conjecture, that it should be read ὁ ὢν, ὁ ἐπι παντων Θεος, is not more fortunate. Such a mode of expression as ὁ ὢν ὁ, all relating to the same subject, is repugnant to Greek usage. Besides, this conjecture, like that of Schlichting, not only violates the integrity of the text, but assigns the article to ϑεος, and omits it before ἐυλογητος, which is surely inadmissible.

Enough of amending the apostle's words by conjecture, without the authority of a single manuscript or version. Critical acumen has also employed itself in dividing and translating the verse in question, in a manner different from that in our common Testament. The late Professor Justi, at Marburg, a man of great acuteness and fine taste, undertook to defend the ingenious supposition, that the latter part of the verse is a doxology. He renders it, "Whose ancestors were those [renowned] fathers from whom the Messiah, as to his mortal body, was derived, who is exalted over all [the fathers.] God be blessed for ever!" Thus, by the aid of supplying an idea not contained in the text, and by doing violence to the custom of language, in the doxological part, he has devised a method in which we may avoid the assertion, that Christ is *God over all*, or *Supreme God.* But who does not perceive the violence and inaptitude of the divulsion which he makes, by separating the former from the latter part of the verse? Besides, how would a doxology fit the passage in question? Crellius (Init. Evang. Johan. p. 230, 237,) long ago was candid enough to own, that when the apostle was affected with the greatest sadness, on account of the unbelief of his Jewish brethren, and the loss of their privileges, a *doxology* was not very congruous. A prayer (as in x. 1,) would seem, as he thinks, to be much more appropriate.

---

[3] As it stands in the Textus Receptus.

Omitting, however, all this, it may be added, that Greek usage by no possibility admits of the doxological version of Justi. Θεος ἐυλογητεις means, *God who is blessed*, that is, the proposition in such a case is assumed, not asserted. But ἐυλογητος ὁ Θεος means, *God be blessed; let God be blessed or praised.* In accordance with this Greek usage, we find five instances of doxology in the New Testament, and about forty in the Old, in which ἐυλογητος is uniformly *placed* FIRST. The same order is observed in respect to καταϱατος (cursed,) when an imprecation is uttered.

Besides, the text must be changed to make out a doxology; and we must read ὁ Θεος instead of Θεος; for universal usage prescribes ἐυλογητος ὁ Θεος. (The instance Psal. lxviii. 19, Sept. brought by Stolz in his *Erlaeuterungen*, &c. to support Justi's rendering, depends merely on wrong punctuation, and the repetition of a word which does not correspond to the Hebrew text.)

Finally, if a doxology to the Father were intended here, it is scarcely possible to suppose that a particle of transition (δε, for instance) should not have been inserted, in order to give notice of so great a change. In any other case, we should expect to find it thus,—ὁ δε ὢν; or, if the doxology begin at Θεος, then ἐυλογητος ὁ Θεος. No text, no manuscript, no ancient version, gives us a trace of either of these readings. To invent them, therefore, and force them upon the text, or to substitute a conjecture, which originated from theological speculation, against the plain and incontrovertible evidence of the integrity of the text, what is it but to introduce a principle fundamentally subversive of all interpretation and criticism, and give up the Scriptures to be moulded to every man's own wishes?

All conjectures and theories, then, appear to be quite incompetent to explain away the common rendering of the verse, and the meaning connected with it. On the other hand, we may ask, How comes it that Christ, *according to his human nature* (το κατα σαϱκα) is said to have descended from the fathers? What if I should affirm that David, as to his human nature, was descended from Jesse? Would you not of course ask, what other nature had he except human? And such an inquiry, forced upon us by the expression in question, the apostle has immediately answered. As to his nature not human, he was "Supreme God, blessed for ever. Amen!" To have produced the human nature connected with such an exalted Being, the apostle reckons as one of the special privileges which the Jews had enjoyed. See and compare Rom. ix. 1—4.

I do not argue that Christ is divine, merely from having the appellation Θεος bestowed upon him. But if ὁ ὢν ἐπ' παντων Θεος be not *Supreme God*, and if the *antithesis* in this verse do not require us to understand a divine nature here, then I must despair of discovering the sentiment of any text of Scripture, by using any of the rules of exegesis.

Heb. i. 8, 9. "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."

This passage is quoted from Ps. xlv. 6, 7. It has been objected, that ὁ ϑεος here should not be translated as the vocative but nominative,—*e. g.* "God is thy throne for ever and ever, or thine everlasting throne, or eternal support."

To this it may be replied, ὁ ϑεος is the *common* vocative of the *New Testament and Septuagint.* No objection to the usual rendering of this verse in the vocative case can be made from the *form* of the word, which is altogether common in Hellenistic Greek.[4] The Attics use the same form of the noun, but they write it ὦ ϑεος, and not ὁ ϑεος. One needs only to open his Septuagint, in the Book of Psalms, or in almost any other part, to see incontrovertible evidence that ὁ ϑεος is the common vocative of the *Hellenistic* writers.

To the translation, "God is thy throne," that is, thy support, several objections may be made.

1. Greek *usage* does not permit such a version. The subject and predicate cannot both have the article, unless in the case of a convertible or reciprocal sentence; and surely it will not be urged that such is the present case. "*God is thy throne*," would stand, in Greek, ϑϱονος σου ὁ ϑεος.[5] For such a change in the text there is no respectable authority.

2. Such a translation would render insipid the argument of the apostle, in this chapter, to prove the pre-eminently exalted nature of Christ. To say of this illustrious personage, God is thy throne, that is, thy support, might excite the persons to whom the epistle was addressed to ask, "And who is not supported by God? How is Christ entitled, on this account, to claim any *pre-eminence* in our regard?"

3. Such a translation contradicts the meaning of the word *throne*, understood either literally or figuratively. Literally, it is the *seat* on which kings sit. This sense is here out of

[4] There were several dialects of the Greek language; the Attic, the Doric, &c. The Hellenistic Greek is a mixed dialect, which prevailed in the countries and periods in which the New Testament writers lived.

[5] See the latter clause of the verse, where ἡ ϱαϐδος is the subject, but ϱαϐδος the predicate, according to the laws of the language.

the question. *Figuratively*, it stands for *dominion, empire, regal authority;* because it is one of the ensigns of such authority. But there is no such figurative sense to it as that of *support.* And what sense would it make to say, *God is thy dominion, thy regal authority?* If you reply, This may mean, God is the cause of thy *dominion or regal authority*, then I ask again, Of what king's dominion and authority is not God the cause? Is it not the universal doctrine of the Bible that "*by him* kings reign and princes decree justice?" And how then is Christ entitled to any *pre-eminence* because God is the cause of his dominion? Or what advance does the apostle make in his argument by such an assertion?

To the translation in question there is still another objection, which is drawn from the nature of Hebrew parallelism in poetry. The verse under discussion plainly is one in which the *subject* is the same in both parts, that is, it is a synonymous parallelism. Now, the second member of this is, "the sceptre of thy kingdom is a sceptre of righteousness;" in other words, *thy dominion is righteous.* The first member of the parallelism, consequently, is to be explained in a similar way, and evidently means *thy dominion* (throne) *is everlasting.* What could be more tasteless or unmeaning here than to say, "God is thy throne," that is, support, or cause of dominion, when the object of the writer is to shew the *pre-eminent* dignity of the Son of God?

The proposed mode of rendering, then, violates Greek usage, frustrates the argument of the apostle, forces an unexampled meaning upon ϑρονος, and transgresses the laws of parallelism in the Hebrew original, from which the passage was taken.

I am aware of the objections which have been made to understanding the word *God*, in the passage now under consideration, in its highest sense. For, first, It is said that the person called God (*Elohim*) here calls another being *his God*, and therefore he cannot be supreme.

To the *fact* I readily assent; but the *conclusion* drawn from it I must be permitted to doubt. If Christ be described in the forty-fifth Psalm (and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews asserts this to be the fact,) he is described as a king triumphant over his enemies. As the Messiah, the Anointed King, he might, with the greatest propriety, call Jehovah his God — for as Messiah he is to be considered as incarnate — and of course subordinate. Is it still a matter of wonder that the same person could at one time be called *God*, and have everlasting dominion ascribed to him, who the next moment calls Jehovah *his God?* It is a wonder of the same nature as that which perplexed the Jews, when Christ asked them how David could call the Messiah *Lord*, while at the same time he was his Son. It is a wonder which no ground but that of Trinitarians can ever explain. I mean the ground, that the divine and human natures co-existed in Christ, and that in the same sentence he could with propriety speak of himself as human and divine. The sacred writers appear not to take the least pains to separate the two natures in any thing which they say of either. They every where speak of Christ (so it appears to me) as either human or divine, or both. They do not seem to apprehend any danger of mistake in regard to the subject, no more than we, when we say, Abraham is dead, or Abraham is alive, think it necessary to add, *as to his body* in one case, or *as to his soul* in the other.

This very negligence (if I may be allowed the expression, saving every thing that would imply improper want of care) offers a powerful argument to me, I confess, to prove that the sacred writers regarded the human and divine natures as so intimately connected in Christ, that it was unnecessary and inexpedient to attempt a distinctive separation of them, on every occasion which brought to view the person or actions of Christ.

A second objection is urged, namely, that the King, who is the subject of the forty-fifth Psalm, not only calls God *his* God, but is said "to be anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows." If Christ be truly divine, how, it is asked, can he have *fellows*, that is, equals?

The answer to this has, in substance, already been given. Christ is introduced here as the incarnate Messiah. To the *office of King*, God "consecrated him with the oil of gladness," that is, placed him in a royal station; he has the "oil of gladness above his fellows," or a rank above those who also hold a regal office.

It has been objected, thirdly, that the forty-fifth Psalm, from which our text was taken, does not belong to the Messiah, but to David or Solomon But how is this proved? "The language," it is said, "is such as to shew that it is a mere epithalamium or nuptial ode on the marriage of one of these kings with a foreign princess." I have no time to enter into a discussion of this topic here; but I am satisfied that the difficulties which press upon such a view of the forty-fifth Psalm are overwhelming. Whatever may be said, moreover, to prove this, unless it be palpable demonstration, cannot weigh much in the minds of those who regard the authority of the writer that composed the Epistle to the Hebrews. He has told us that the passage in question, is *addressed to his Son.*

Here, then, if our view be correct, is one instance more in which Christ is called God, with adjuncts which render it probable that the Supreme God is meant.

I should rank the texts which I have already produced as the leading ones to establish the divine nature of Christ. But there are others which should not be neglected, in an impartial examination of Scripture evidence, on the present topic.

1 John, v. 20, "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life."

There are two reasons here why (ὁ ἀληθινος ϑεος) *the true God*, may be referred to Christ. 1. The grammatical construction favours it: Christ is the immediate antecedent. I grant that pronouns sometimes relate to a more remote antecedent; but cases of this nature stand on the ground of necessity, not of common grammatical usage. What doubt can there be, that John could, without scruple, call the *Logos the true God* (ὁ ἀληθινος ϑεος,) whom he had before asserted to be *God* and *to have created all things?*

But, secondly, my principal reason for referring *the true God* (ὁ ἀληθινος ϑεος) to Christ, is the other adjunct which stands with it: "This is the true God, and the ETERNAL LIFE." How familiar is this language with John, as applied to Christ! "In him (that is, Christ) was LIFE—this LIFE was the light of men—giving LIFE to the world—the bread of LIFE—my words are spirit and LIFE—I am the way, the truth, and the LIFE—the Logos of LIFE. This LIFE (Christ) was manifested, and we have *seen it*, and do testify to you and declare the ETERNAL LIFE, which was with the Father, and was manifested to us," (1 John, i. 2.) Now, as I cannot find any instance in John's writings, in which the appellation of LIFE and *eternal* LIFE is bestowed upon the Father, to designate him as the author of spiritual and eternal life, and as this occurs so frequently in John's writings, as applied to Christ—the laws of exegesis compel me here to accord in my exposition with the common laws of grammar, and to construe both ὁ ἀληθινος ϑεος, and ἡ ζωη ἀιωνιος (or, as some manuscripts, more consonantly with Greek idiom, read ἡ ζωη ἡ ἀιωνιος,) both of Christ. If the *true* God then be not really divine, who is?

John, xx. 28. "And Thomas answered, and said unto him, My Lord and my God."

I have three reasons for adducing this text. 1. There is no satisfactory proof that it is an exclamation of surprise or astonishment. No phrase of this kind, by which the Jews were accustomed to express surprise and astonishment, has yet been produced; and there is no evidence that such a phrase, with the sense alleged, belongs to this language. 2. The Evangelist tells us, that Thomas addressed himself to Jesus, and *said to him*, ἑιπεν ἀυτω; he did not merely *exclaim*. 3. The commendation, which the Saviour immediately bestows upon Thomas, serves chiefly to defend the meaning that I attach to the verse. Christ commends him for having seen and believed. The evidence that he believed was contained in the expression under examination; for, before uttering this expression, he is represented as doubting. On the supposition, then, that the expression was a mere exclamation, what evidence was it to the mind of Jesus, or could it be to the minds of others, that he admitted the claims of the Saviour of men, to the character which was connected with this office? What more proof of real belief can be found in such an *exclamation*, if it be truly one, that we can find that men are Christians, when they repeat, as is very common on occasions of surprise or delight, the name of Christ by way of exclamation? But if we admit that the words of Thomas were the proper evidence and expression of that belief, for which the Saviour commended him, (and I do not see how we can fairly avoid this) then we must admit that he will commend us for believing that he is both *Lord and God* Κυριος και Θεος, unless we adopt the notable expedient of Schlichting, who avers that *Lord* is to be referred to *Christ*, and *God* to the *Father;* which latter, he thinks, Thomas spoke, after some interval of time had elapsed.

I pass over several passages where our common text applies the name of God to Christ; *e. g.* Acts, xx. 28, and 1 Tim. iii. 16. In regard to this latter text, however, it appears to me a plain case, that the authorities which Griesbach himself has adduced, would fairly lead to a decision different from his own, respecting the genuineness of the reading, Θεος. I will not attempt to weigh them here; as I feel no desire to press into my service witnesses of a character at all dubious. I admit the great desert of Griesbach, in his critical edition of the New Testament. I believe he was a man who would not willingly or consciously misrepresent either facts or arguments, for or against any reading. But the work which he undertook was too great to be accomplished by one person, or even by one whole generation of critics. Dr Laurence, in his Essay upon the Classification of Manuscripts by Griesbach, has rendered it more than probable that Griesbach's account of facts is not unfrequently *very erroneous*, not through design, but from human infirmity; and that the principles by which he estimated the value of manuscripts, and of course the genuineness of particular readings, are fundamentally erroneous. And, since I am on this subject, I may take the liberty to state, what seems to be so little known among us, that Griesbach is not the only recent editor of a critical Testament, to which the great body of critics attach importance. The celebrated Matthäi, whom Middleton calls the best Greek scholar that ever edited a Greek Testament, published at Riga (A. D. 1782—1788) a critical Testament, of twelve volumes, which approaches much nearer to the Textus Receptus, than the edition of Griesbach, with whom he is at variance. Eichhorn (after giving a high character to this edition of Matthäi, and noticing that, in his maxims respecting the formation of the New Testament text, the editor differs very much from Griesbach and others) says, that "for a long time he had followed the middle path between the two parties." [Bibliothek. Band ii. St. 2. s. 411.]

The whole system of classifying manuscripts, which lies at the very foundation of all Griesbach's decisions in regard to the text, is rejected by Matthäi as worthless; and Dr Laurence has, in the essay above mentioned, made an attack on the same classification, which renders questionable the principles of it; at least, the application of those principles as made by Griesbach.

Professor Knapp, of Halle, has also published a Greek Testament, the text of which is independent of Griesbach's, although it approximates to it. The edition is esteemed for its punctuation, order of words, accentuation, and spirituation; and has great currency.

I acknowledge this is digression. But it may be useful to those who are in the habit of attributing so much weight to Griesbach's decisions, to know that they are far from being uncontroverted by many of the best critics among his own countrymen. I know of no commentator of note who has made Griesbach's text his basis, except Paulus; and he has re-examined all his decisions.

To return, however, to our subject: we do not want, and feel no disposition to use, either of the texts referred to above as proof texts, in the question before us.

There is another class of texts, which I have not hitherto mentioned, because the certainty of their meaning is commonly thought to be less capable of demonstration than that of others which I have produced. I refer to such texts as Ephes. v. 5, "The kingdom of Christ and God;" Titus, ii. 13, "Looking for the blessed hope and glorious appearance of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ;" 2 Tim. iv. 1, "I adjure you before God, even Jesus Christ, who will judge the quick and the dead at his appearance and kingdom;" 2 Pet. i. 1, "of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ."

The translation of these texts here proposed is altogether in conformity to the Greek idiom. Middleton (on the article) thinks it absolutely *essential* to it: For, although proper names and abstract nouns, in such a connection as Θεος and Χριστος here, may take the article before the first noun, and omit it before the second, and yet designate *different things and persons;* yet if words which are *attributives* omit the article in such a case, they exhibit evidence that they are to be connected with a preceding noun, and are the predicates of it, and not significant of something separate, *e. g.* in the first case, Eph. v. 5, "the kingdom of Christ and God," according to this rule, would mean, *of Christ who is God;* in the second instance, Tit. ii. 13, the meaning is, "of the great God, who is our Saviour," &c.

Mr Wordsworth, a few years since, instituted a most laborious investigation of the Greek Fathers, to see whether the idiom which respects the article here was prevalent in their writings; and whether they ever understood more than *one person* to be designated by such expressions. The result I will give in his own words. (P. 132.)

"I have observed more, I am persuaded, than a thousand instances of the form, ὁ Χριστος και Θεος (*Christ and God*, Eph. v. 5;) some hundreds of instances of ὁ μεγας Θεος και σωτηρ (*the great God and Saviour*, Tit. ii. 13;) and not fewer than several thousands of the form ὁ Θεος και σωτηρ (*God and Saviour*, 2 Pet. i. 1;) while in no single case have I seen, where the sense could be determined, any one of them used, *but only of one person.*"

After all, if there were no other evidence of the divinity of Christ in the New Testament than what depends solely on these texts, one might perhaps hesitate concerning the subject. But when I consider that the method of translating here proposed is perfectly conformable to the Greek idiom, and must be adopted in various other passages (*e. g.* Rom. xv. 6, Eph. v. 20, James, i. 27,) and if adopted in these, will give them a sense conformable to that of other parts of the sacred volume, I confess the evidence which these passages afford, if not decisive, at least confirms in no small degree the testimony of other texts,—specially in this case, in regard to the text in Titus; for where is the *appearing* of God the Father ever spoken of by the New Testament writers? It is *Christ* who *appeared* to execute vengeance upon the Jewish nation,—who will *appear* at the judgment. Yet here, the *appearance of the great God* is mentioned—of the *great God and Saviour;* for so I cannot but believe the text is fairly to be construed. Can this *great God* be any other than Christ himself?

Thus much for the texts which bestow on Christ the appellation of God, with adjuncts that shew in what sense the word God must be understood, according to the common rules of interpreting language. I must now

II. Examine another class, which attribute to Christ equality with God, or that power and dignity or honour which belong to God.

I use the phrase *equality* with God, after the example of the Apostle, in the text to be immediately examined. I know, at the same time, it is a phrase that leads, if any are so disposed, to logomachy. What I mean by it is explained by the words which immediately follow it.

Phil. ii. 5—8. "Let the same mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus; who, being in the condition of God, did not regard his equality with God as an object of solicitous desire, but humbled himself (assumed an inferior or humble station,) taking the condition of a servant, being made after the similitude of men ; and being found in fashion as a man, he exhibited his humility by obedience, even to the death of the cross."

Such is the rendering which, after laborious examination, I am persuaded the Greek of this passage not only admits, but demands. I will state my reasons for dissenting from the common method in which either Trinitarians or Unitarians have translated it.

Our common version runs thus,—"Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but humbled himself," &c. This version seems to render nugatory, or at least irrelevant, a part of the Apostle's reasoning in the passage. He is enforcing the principle of Christian humility upon the Philippians. In order to urge this in the most effectual manner, he proposes to them the example of Christ,—"Let the same mind be in you which was in Christ." What was this? It was manifested by the fact, that though essentially divine (ἐν μορφη Θεου,) he did not eagerly retain his divine condition, but assumed the station or condition of a servant, (μορφην δουλου.) Here the relevancy of his reasoning is sufficiently plain. But how was it any proof or example of humility, that *he did not think it robbery to be equal with God?*

Besides, the Greek will not fairly bear this construction. ‘Αρπαγμος, translated *robbery*, does not seem here to signify *an act of robbery*, but *res rapta*, or rather, figuratively *res avide diripienda et vindicanda*,—that is, something which is eagerly to be seized and appropriated. (See Schleusner and Storr, in locum.) Moreover, ἁρπαγμος, which our translators have placed next to the verb ηγησατο, does not, by the rules of syntax, belong there. The Greek syntax would place the words thus, as to their sense,—ὀυκ ἡγησατο το ἐιναι ἰσα Θεω [κατα] ἁρπαγμον, literally, "he regarded not the being equal to God (as) ἁρπαγμον, as a thing to be greedily sought or appropriated."

For these reasons, I cannot believe that our common version gives the sense of the passage. And, for similar reasons, I feel compelled to reject the version so common among some Unitarians,—"He did not think of the robbery of being equal with God." The objections to it are, that it translates ἁρπαγμον here, as designating the *action of robbery ;* and that ὀυκ ἡγησατο το ἐιναι ἰσα Θεω ἁρπαγμον can never be proved to mean, "He thought not of the robbery OF *being equal* with God." The verb ἡγησατο is not susceptible of such a meaning as *thought not of*,—that is, *did not aspire to, imagine, form expectations of*, &c. In its primary sense it signifies *to lead, to be pre-eminent*, &c. ; in its secondary sense, to *esteem, judge, regard, repute*, &c. To render ὀυκ ἡγησατο ἁρπαγμον, *he did not think of the robbery*, would therefore be violating the obvious principles of the Greek language. To justify in any measure such a version, the passage must run thus,—ου ΤΟΝ ἁρπαγμον ἡγησατο ΤΟΥ εἶναι ἰσα Θεω. Even then, ἡγησατο could not be rendered *thought not of*. The word does not permit this sense. And, as no ancient manuscript or version has given a hint of such a form of the text, it seems to be placed beyond fair debate, that the translation now in question cannot be admitted.

Both our translators and Unitarians appear, generally, to have mistaken the import of the word μορφη (*condition, state*) in this passage. On the one hand, μορφη does not seem to me at all parallel with the *brightness* (ἀπαυγασμα) and *express image* (χαρακτηρ) which are applied to the Son, in Heb. i. 3. These words designate the glory of the incarnate Messiah, who had appeared "in these last days," and spoken to men. They express the same view of Christ which John gives (i. 14,) when he says, "We beheld his (Christ's) glory,—verily the glory of the only begotten of the Father ; and this glory was seen after the 'Word became flesh and dwelt among us.'" Comparison, then, of μορφη Θεου with these passages, will not ascertain its meaning ; for, to Christ belonged the μορφη Θεου (*the condition of God*,) *before* he humbled himself and took upon him the form of a servant. In occupying, indeed, the condition of a servant (if I may so express the Greek ἐκενωσε ἑαυτον,) consisted his humiliation.

A fair examination of μορφη, either generally or in special relation to the passage before us, will end, as I must believe, in the conviction that the word is not unfrequently synonymous with φυσις (nature) and οὐσια (being.) The proofs which Schleusner has offered of this are sufficient. (Lex. in voc. μορφη.) But the proof of what it means in the passage before us, is too plain to be easily mistaken. If you say μορφη Θεου means only a similitude or resemblance of God in *moral* qualities, as we speak of Christians resembling God, then I ask whether his humiliation consisted in depressing, or subjecting to a lower state, the moral qualities, which Christ possessed?

Does μορφη Θεου mean, then, a resemblance to God in respect to *office*, as magistrates are called *gods?* But, on the supposition that Christ was only a *finite* being, what office did he lay aside in order to become incarnate? If Christ be only a created being, who were his subjects, and what was his dominion, before his mediatorial kingdom commenced by the event of his incarnation?

But this is not all. If μορφη mean only *similitude*, then what is the sense of the next clause, where Christ is said to have taken upon him the μορφην δουλου? That he bore merely a *resemblance* to a servant—that is, to *one who obeys*, or is in an humble station; or that he did *actually* take the condition of one who was in an humble and depressed state, and persevere in it to the very death of the cross? The latter must be admitted, unless we hearken to the doctrine of the Docetæ, who taught that Christ was a man in *appearance* only, and not in reality. If *μορφη δουλου*, then, means the condition or state of one who is humbled or depressed, and subjected to the command of others, does not *μορφη ϑεου* mean the state or condition of one who is truly divine?

After all, it should be sacredly remembered, that, on such a subject as this, human language (made up of terms formed to express the ideas of finite and mutable beings about finite and mutable objects) is of course incompetent fully to designate the mode of union between the divine and human natures. I must regard the language here, and in all other passages on this awful subject, as only an *approximation* toward describing what exists in the Divinity, or is done by him — he who was in the condition of God, and equal with God, that is, divine, *ἐκενωσε ἑαυτον*, which means, as we translate it, "*exinanivit seipsum—made himself of no reputation.*" Yet how incompetent must these translations be! So far as Christ is the immutable God, he cannot change—that is, he cannot *divest himself* of his essential perfections. He cannot cease to be omnipotent, omniscient, &c. But he may veil the brightness of his glories for a time by assuming to himself a union with the human nature, and making this the organ through which he displays his perfections during the time of the incarnation. Does the sun cease to shine, are his beams extinguished, when an intervening cloud obscures for a while his lustre? or is the sun in any measure changed?

In reply to a multitude of questions with which you and others can press Trinitarians on this subject, we may ask, Because God is omnipotent, does it follow that the whole of that omnipotence must be every moment exerted? If not, (and who will refuse assent to this?) then why may he not have veiled his glories for a time in the incarnate Saviour, and still retain all his essential perfections unchanged? Is it too much to say that he may have done so? I believe that the text in question decides that he *did*.

I approach such a subject, however, with solemn awe; and never feel my own weakness and ignorance more intensely than while endeavouring to think upon it. The familiar, I had almost said, irreverential manner in which some speak and write respecting this mystery, is calculated, I freely acknowledge, to excite painful emotions. On the one hand, it would seem, if we are to credit one mode of representation, that the greatest portion of Christ's humiliation consisted in his having renounced and absolutely laid aside his divinity during the time of the incarnation; and that, *as God*, in this diminished condition, he did actually expire upon the cross. All the powers of language are exhausted, in order to shew how great must be the sufferings and condescension of Christ in undergoing such a degradation as this. On the other hand, some who revolt from these mistaken representations, verge to the other extreme. Lest they should degrade the divine nature of Christ, they are so careful to separate the human nature from it, that one is compelled to suppose that the man Jesus had simply a higher degree of inspiration and communion with God than other prophets. The New Testament does not seem to me to justify either of these extremes.

A thousand questions may be raised here—a thousand difficulties suggested, which no reflecting man will undertake to answer. The history of past ages exhibits an appalling picture of disputes about the person of Christ — all springing from the denial of *facts* revealed in the New Testament, or from the unhallowed curiosity of men who desired to know what God has not revealed. The very last age witnessed a dispute in Germany between the theologian's of Giessen and Tubingen, whether the humiliation (*κενωσις*) of Christ consisted "in abstinence from both the direct and reflex use of divine majesty," or in the "occultation of divine majesty," a dispute which agitated the Lutheran Church to the very centre.

The humble inquirer after truth, who once is brought clearly to see the boundaries of human knowledge, will shrink from disputations of such a nature, and pour forth his earnest supplications to God that the simple verities which the Scriptures reveal may be believed on the authority of God; while the *manner* in which the facts revealed for our credence exist, is left with him "whose ways are unsearchable, and whose judgments are past finding out."

I have used the freedom of letter-writing in this discussion; I can hardly call it digression, as it is so nearly connected with the explanation of the text which I am examining. Will you now permit me to repeat, that the version which would correspond best with the real meaning of the passage in question, must express the following ideas? "Who, being of divine nature or condition, did not eagerly seek to retain his equality with God, but took on himself an humble condition," &c. In this way, and in this only, does the passage appear to be consistent with the Apostle's argument and design, at least appropriate to them; and in this way only can the Greek be fairly and grammatically rendered.

With the passage that has now been considered, seem to me to agree, in general import, several others. John, v. 19, "Whatsoever things he (the Father) doeth, the same doeth the Son likewise;" that is, he has the same power as the Father. And when it is said in the context, "The Son doeth nothing by (or of, ἀπο ἀφ') himself, except he see the Father do it," I understand the meaning to be, that the Jews had no reason to believe that Christ had any disposition to blaspheme God, (of which they had so frequently accused him,) for he acted in entire concert with the divine purposes and commands, and had no separate interests of his own.

John, v. 21—23, "For as the Father raiseth the dead, and restoreth them to life, so also the Son restoreth to life whom he pleases. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all men might honour the Son, even as they honour the Father."

Is there not here an equality of power and honour ascribed to the Father and the Son? The Son is indeed introduced as "head over all things;" but could he be such a head, could "*all* judgment be committed to him," if at the same time he was not also divine, and consequently omniscient? It is perfectly plain, that, in so far as the "committing of judgment to the Son" is concerned, it must be to the mediatorial person — to one who, in respect to office, is subordinate to God. But in so far as *qualifications* requisite to perform the duties which that *commitment* requires are concerned, the Saviour is divine; and the honour to be claimed by him is the same with that which the Divinity himself claims. It matters not whether you interpret this of obedience to be rendered to the Son, or of homage to be paid to him. Multitudes of prophets, as commissioned by God, have borne his messages of mercy and of judgment to his people; but to whom, among them all, did he grant the privilege of being honoured as himself? Or to what created being shall the glory of the blessed God be rendered, without infringing upon the fundamental principles of both the Jewish and the Christian religion?

In fact, I cannot well conceive how our Saviour could have used the words above quoted without having exposed himself to renewed and just accusations of the Jews for blaspheming, unless he were really divine. The Jews had accused him of violating the Sabbath, because he had on that day healed the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda. The reply of Christ to them was, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work;" which, if I understand the argument, must mean, My Father has never ceased to work on the Sabbath in carrying on all the operations of the natural and moral world; he supersedes the law of the Sabbath. I have the same right. "The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath." The Jews then sought to slay him, because, as they affirmed, "he had violated the Sabbath, and said that God was his Father, *making himself equal with God.*" In reply to their bitter accusations, Jesus made use of the language above cited,—telling them that he did whatever the Father did, and was entitled to the same honour. Was this relinquishing his claim to the equality with God which the Jews had charged him with assuming? Or was it speaking out plainly that he wrought on the Sabbath by the same right that the Father did, and was entitled to the same deference? Can his words, interpreted without regard to any preconceived theory, be made to signify less than this?

You will expect me, perhaps, to adduce John, x. 30, "I and my Father are one." It is a clear case that the Jews here seem to have understood Christ as claiming equality with God, or rather claiming to be God. (See verse 33.) But I am not satisfied that the manner in which they often expounded his words is a sure guide for our interpretation of them at the present time. The malignant disposition which they frequently displayed may well lead us to suspect that they would, if possible, put such a construction on his words as would subject him to the imputation of blasphemy or rebellion against the Roman government. I would expound the words of Christ, therefore, independently of any construction which his imbittered enemies put upon them. And, in the present case, it seems to me that the meaning of "I and my Father are one," is simply, "I and my Father are united in counsel, design, and power."

So in John, xvii. 20, 21, Christ prays that all who shall believe on him *may be one*. "As thou, Father," continued he, "art in me, and I in thee; so they also *may be one* in us," —that is, that the disciples may have the "same mind which was in Christ Jesus"—may copy after his example, and be united in the temper of their souls to him, as he is to God—*may be one* with the Father and with him.

So also in Gal. iii. 28, Christians of different ranks and nations are said to *be one* in Christ; and 1 Cor. iii. 3, he that planteth and he that watereth *are one*,—that is, they have the same affections and designs—they are united to accomplish the same object. In the same manner, Cicero says, "Unus fiat e pluribus," *many constitute one*, when persons are united in temper and pursuits. (De Offic. l. i. c. 17.)

From the consideration of those texts which ascribe in a general sense equality with God, or divine power and honours to Christ, let us now turn,—

III. To the examination of those which assert or imply that particular divine attributes, or works, belong to him.

1. *Omniscience is ascribed to Christ.*

Matt. xi. 27. "All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."

If in this passage the same *omniscience* be not ascribed to the Son as to the Father, I am unable to make out satisfactorily what the meaning of it is. In the latter clause of the verse, men are declared to be entirely dependent on the Son for that knowledge of the Father which is revealed,—that is, he only makes this revelation. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten, who dwelleth in the bosom of the Father, *he hath revealed him*," John, i. 18. At the same time, I concede, it is *possible* that the knowledge here spoken of may be merely that which is intended to be revealed in the Gospel.

John, vi. 46, "Because that no man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father." The word εωρακε here, does not mean *to see with bodily eyes*, but *with the mental eye*,—that is, to know. What but omniscience could be adequate to the knowledge here predicated of Christ? And is it a satisfactory explanation of the text to say that the knowledge here meant is simply that which is conveyed in the instructions of the Gospel?

In the same manner, the knowledge of the most intimate secrets of the human heart is ascribed to Christ. John, ii. 24, 25, "But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men; and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man." John, vi. 64, "But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew who they were that believed not, and who should betray him."

Acts, i. 24, "And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen." That *Lord* (Κυριος) here means *Christ*, seems to me very plain from verses 21 and 22 (compare verse 6) of the context. Besides, this is the *common* appellation of the Saviour in the Acts of the Apostles. The appeal made in this case, respects the *choice of an Apostle.* "Shew, Lord," say the Apostles, "which of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and *apostleship*."

Is there any room to doubt here, that the Apostles did appeal to the same Lord who had chosen them, to designate who should fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Judas?

1 Cor. iv. 4, 5—"For I know nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified; but he that judgeth me is the Lord. Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall every man have praise of God." That *Lord* (Κυριος) here means Christ, is plain, both from the office of judging ascribed to him, and from his *coming* to judgment. Without citing numerous other passages, which confessedly represent Christ as the final Judge of all the human race, permit me here to ask, Is it possible for any being who is not *omniscient* to judge the universe of intelligent creatures? Can he for thousands of years (possibly of ages) be present every where, and know what is transacted—can he penetrate the recesses of the human heart—can he remember the whole character and actions of countless myriads, so diverse in talents, temper, circumstances, and situation; and yet be finite—be neither *omnipresent* nor *omniscient?* God claims it as his distinguishing and peculiar prerogative, that he knows the secrets of the human heart, Jer. xvii. 10; what then must he be who knows the secrets of all hearts, at all times, and in all worlds? If he be not God, the proof that the Father is God is defective too; and we have the question again to dispute with the Manicheans, whether Jehovah be not a limited and imperfect being.

"But," you will say, "Christ acts as Judge by delegated authority: why not, then, by knowledge imparted to him?" He does indeed *act* as judge by delegated authority, because it is in his mediatorial capacity that he acts as Judge; but to *act* as Judge is one thing, to be *qualified* for such an office is another. Exaltation as Mediator constitutes him Judge in that capacity; *omnipresence* and *omniscience only* can qualify him for the duties of that station. And can *omniscience* be *imparted?* We may as well say *omnipotence* or *self-existence* can be imparted. There is and there can be but *one* God; and a second omniscient being (omniscient simply by knowledge *imparted*,) would force us into all the absurdities of polytheism.

Rev. ii. 23, "And all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works." The same person speaks here who "was dead and is alive," that is, Christ, (chap. i. 18.) The sense of the passage is too plain to need any comment.

To conclude this head: When I compare such passages as those above cited, with the description of divine omniscience, how can I doubt that the New Testament writers mean to ascribe the *knowledge of all things* to Christ? To say that whatsoever pertains to God or man, is known by any being, is to predicate omniscience of that being. Compare now with this the knowledge which God ascribes to himself only, in Jer. xvii. 9, 10, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it? I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins, even to give to every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings."

2. *Divine power is ascribed to Christ.*

Phil. iii. 21,—"Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself."

Compare now this passage, 1 Cor. xv. 26—28, where the same language is applied to God the Father. And if "to subdue all things to himself," (ὑποταξαι τα παντα ἑαυτω) be not characteristic of omnipotence in Phil. iii. 21, when applied to Christ, why should it be when applied in verse 28 to the Father?

Heb. i. 3, "Who, being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." The word φερων, which is translated *upholding*, means *preserving*, *directing*, *governing*. Thus Chrysostom,—φερων, says he, κυβερνων, διαπιπτοντα συγκρατων, that is, *governing*, *preserving* things perishable. So the corresponding Hebrew word, in Is. xlvi. 3, lxiii. 9.

In John, x. 18, Christ says, "I have power to lay down my life, and to resume it again." In other places, the resurrection of Jesus is ascribed to God,—Acts, ii. 24, 32; iii. 15; v. 30; 1 Cor. vi. 14.; xv. 15.

In 2 Pet. i. 3, *divine power* (θεια δυναμις) is ascribed to Christ; compare verse 16.

Most decisive, however, of divine power belonging to Christ, are those passages above, which ascribe to him the creation of the universe. This is the distinguishing characteristic of Jehovah. Jer. x. 10—16. "But the Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting King. At his wrath the earth shall tremble, and the nations shall not be able to abide his indignation. Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens. He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion. When he uttereth his voice, there is a multitude of waters in the heavens, and he causeth the vapours to ascend from the ends of the earth; he maketh lightnings, with rain, and bringeth forth the wind out of his treasures. Every man is brutish in his knowledge; every founder is confounded by the graven image; for his molten image is falsehood, and there is no breath in them. They are vanity, and the work of errors: In the time of their visitation they shall perish. *The portion of Jacob is not like them; for he is the former of all things;* and Israel is the rod of his inheritance: *The Lord of Hosts is his name.*"

Acts, xiv. 15, "Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you, that ye should turn from these vanities unto the *living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein.*"

When I read such passages, and compare them with the creative power ascribed to Christ, I cannot but admit, with the Apostle, "that he who *built* all things *is God.*"

3. Eternity *is ascribed to Christ.*

That those passages of Scripture, which speak of Christ's existence before the creation of the world, do not explicitly assert his eternity, I have already suggested. But then it is difficult to conceive that they do not *imply* eternity. "For," says Doederlein, (Inst. Theol. i. p. 390,) "to exist before the beginning of the world, what can it mean but to exist from eternity?" Passages of this nature are the following,—namely, John, i. 1, "*In the beginning* was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God;" 1 John, i. 2, "For the Life was manifested; and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that *eternal Life*, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." John, xvii. 5, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee *before the world was.*" John, xvii. 24, "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me; for thou lovedst me *before the foundation of the world.*"

But specially do I apprehend that Rev. xxii. 13, is decisive on this subject,—"I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end." That it is Christ who here speaks, is clear; for, 1. In the preceding verse he says, "Behold I *come* quickly." 2. In the 16th verse, the same person says, "I Jesus have sent mine angel," &c. Now, the same description that is here applied to Christ, is given of the eternity of God, in xxi. 5, 6; compare verses 7th and 3d. To know still more fully what this form of expression means, we must recur to the Old Testament, where we find it divested of its peculiar shape. In Isaiah, xliv. 6, Jehovah says, "I am the first and I am the last; and besides me there is no God," that is, eternity distinguishes me from all that are falsely called gods. So in Isaiah, xlviii. 12, after declaring that he will not suffer his name to be polluted, nor give his glory to another, he adds, "I am he (that is, the true God;) I am the first, and I also am the last."

Now, if the same things be asserted of Christ, (as plainly they are in the texts under consideration,) how can we avoid the conclusion, that the holy apostle meant to assert his eternal existence?

4. *Divine honours and worship are ascribed to Christ.*

John, v. 23, "That all men might honour the Son even as they honour the Father."

On this text I have before remarked (page 34,) in another connection.

Heb. i. 6, "Let all the angels of God worship him."

The word *worship*, it is said, has two significations,—namely, *obeisance*, and *spiritual homage*. This is true; and the first of these meanings often presents itself in the Old Testament, and (as I am willing to concede) in the Gospels. Many who worshipped Christ, while he sojourned among men—that is, prostrated themselves before him—probably knew or acknowledged nothing of his divine nature. But what shall we say of the *angels?* Are *they* ignorant of his true nature? And is not the worship which they who are pure spirits pay, of course *spiritual*, and not simple obeisance?

Phil. ii. 10, 11, "That at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

"Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth," is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers, for the *universe*, (*το παν*, or *τα παντα.*) What can be meant by things in heaven,—that is, beings in heaven, bowing the knee to Jesus, if spiritual worship be not meant?

What other worship can heaven render? And if the worship of Christ in heaven be spiritual, should not that of others, who ought to be in temper united with them, be spiritual also? And when it is added, this worship shall be "to the glory of God the Father," I understand the sentiment to be, that Jesus, in his mediatorial character, is the proper object of universal adoration; but as this character has a peculiar connection with and relation to God the Father, so the worship paid to Christ the Mediator should redound to the glory of the Father as well as of himself.

Rom. x. 9—14, "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?"

The Lord, *on whose name they are to call*, is plainly Christ; for he is the same in whom *they are to believe*, (verses 11 and 14.) And this Lord (Christ) on whom they are to call, and in whom they are to believe, is *Κυριος παντων*, *universal Lord*, and therefore able to bestow the blessings which they need.

Rev. v. 8—14, "And when he (that is, Christ, see ver. 6, 7) took the book, the four beasts and four-and-twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: For thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: And we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders: And the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands,—saying, with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. And the four beasts said, Amen! And the four-and-twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever."

If this be not *spiritual* worship, and if Christ be not the object of it here, I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine.

The apostles and primitive martyrs worshipped Christ; and they recognize the practice of worshipping him among other Christians.

Acts, vii. 59, 60, "And they stoned Stephen, making invocation (*ἐπικαλουμενον*) and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down, and cried, with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And, when he had said this, he fell asleep."

Now, here is a dying martyr, who is expressly said "to be filled with the Holy Ghost," and to enjoy the vision of the heavenly world, and of the Saviour who was there—in his last moments, too—on the very verge of eternity—here is such a martyr committing his departing spirit into the hands of the Lord Jesus, in the very same language and with the same confidence with which Jesus, when expiring upon the cross, committed his spirit into the hands of the Father. This expiring disciple also implores forgiveness for his murderers. Of whom does he implore it? Of the same Lord Jesus. Can a departing spirit be intrusted to any being, and the forgiveness of sin be expected of him, who has not omnipotence and supreme authority? And can a dying martyr, with his eyes fixed on the very vision of God, and his soul filled with the Holy Ghost, ask and pray amiss?

2 Cor. xii. 8, 9, " For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly, therefore, will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me."

The *Lord*, whom Paul here *besought*, is plainly Christ; for this same Lord, in answer to the apostle's supplication, says, " My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength (ἡ δυναμις μου) is perfected in weakness." Then the apostle immediately subjoins, " Most gladly then would I rejoice in my infirmities, that the *strength of* CHRIST (ἡ δαναμις Χριστου) may rest upon me." A clearer case that Christ was the object of the apostle's repeated prayer, cannot well be presented.

1 Thess. iii. 11, 12, " Now, God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you. And the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you."

Can any distinction be here made between the rank of those who are addressed by the apostle? And does not the 12th verse plainly shew that the supplication of the apostle is specially directed to the Lord, that is, Christ?

2 Thes. ii. 16, 17, " Now, our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation, and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts and stablish you in every good word and work."

Here the order of the persons to whom supplication is made is the reverse of that in the last instance quoted; which shews that nothing depends on the *order*, but that it was a matter of indifference with the apostle which was placed first—the supplication being equally addressed to the Father and to Christ.

Rom. i. 7, " To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints — grace to you and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."

Here the same blessings are solicited and expected from Christ and the Father. (See the same formula repeated, 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2.)

Acts, i. 24, " And they prayed and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen."

That *Lord* here means the Lord Jesus, seems evident from verses 21 and 22. It is the usual appellation, moreover, which the book of Acts gives to the Saviour. (See above, p. 35.)

2 Tim. iv. 14, " The Lord reward him according to his works!" Again, verses 17 and 18, — " Notwithstanding, the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me; that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the Gentiles might hear: And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion. And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom: To whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." (Compare iii. 11.) Usage hardly admits a doubt here that *Lord* means Christ.

Nor can I separate from religious invocation, trust and confidence, such expressions as these, (Acts, iii. 6.) " Then Peter said, Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have, give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk," Nor can I see how the solemn adjuration by Christ (ἐν Χριστῳ) which the apostle uses, Rom. ix. 1; 1 Tim. ii. 7, can be separated from religious invocation or appeal.

We must add to all these instances of worship the fact, that Christians were so habituated to address their supplications to Christ, that " they who invoke Christ" became, it would seem, a kind of proper name by which they were, in primitive times, designated as Christians.

Thus Paul (1 Cor. i. 2) addresses himself to all *who invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ* IN EVERY PLACE. That the verb ἐπικαλεω is an appropriate one to designate the act of prayer, will not be questioned. The literal translation of it is *to invoke*. The simple meaning of the passage is, " I address myself to all Christians." But, instead of using the name Christians directly, the apostle uses a periphrasis, and says *to all the invokers of Christ*, that is, to those who pray to him, meaning the same as ἁγιοις, κλητοις, &c. in the context. He has signified, too, that the practice of *invoking Christ* was not confined to Corinth. He addresses " those who pray to Christ in *every place*," (ἐν παντι τοπῳ.)

Exactly in the same manner does Ananias describe Christians, when the Lord Jesus bade him go to instruct and comfort Saul. Acts, ix. 13, 14, " Lord," said he, " I have heard of many concerning this man, what things he has done (τοις ἁγιοις σου) to thy saints at Jerusalem; and even now he has a commission from the high priest to bind all (τους ἐπικαλουμενους το ὀνομα σου) those who invoke thy name," that is, Christians. See the same thing repeated, verse 21st.

The very heathen, in the primitive age of Christianity, little as they knew about Christians, discovered that they made Christ an object of worship. Says Pliny, in writing to Trajan,[6] (Lib. x. Ep. 97.) " They (Christians) sing in social worship a hymn to Christ as a God."

Eusebius, too, (Eccl. Hist. v. 28,) in writing

[6] Carmen Christo, quasi Deo, soliti essent (*i. e.* Christiani,) dicere secum invicem.

against the Artemonites, appeals to the ancient songs of Christians, thus,—"Whatever psalms and hymns were composed by faithful brethren, from the beginning, *praise Christ the Word of God.*" Can any example of a church in the apostolic age, who did not practise this, be produced?

Did not the Saviour give his disciples a general precept and encouragement, to make him the object of prayer? "If ye shall ask any thing in my name,"—that is, as my disciples, on my account,—said he to the apostles, "I will accomplish it," (ἐγω ποιησω) John, xiv. 13, 14. They appear to me to have understood this, as directing that he should be regarded by them as the special object of prayer. Hence, instead of finding few or no examples of prayer to Christ, in the history of the primitive Christians, as exhibited in the New Testament, I find more of this nature than of any other.

When I have contemplated the precepts which encourage prayer to Christ and the worship of him, both by the inhabitants of the heavenly world, and by the churches on earth, I then compare these things with the exclusive worship and trust which Jehovah claims to himself. Is. xlv. 22, 23, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." Is. xlii. 8, "I am the Lord; that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images." Jer. xvii. 5—7, "Thus saith the Lord, Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord. For he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh; but shall inhabit parched places in the wilderness, in a salt land and not inhabited. Blessed is the man who trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is." Matt. iv. 10, "Then saith Jesus unto him. Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and HIM ONLY shalt thou serve."

I am ready now to ask, whether I can avoid coming to the conclusion, either that Christ is truly divine, inasmuch as he is so often represented as the object of worship; or that the sacred writers have mistaken this great point, and led us to that which must be considered as idolatry. And yet the worship of Christ is placed, as it would seem, in opposition to that of idols, (1 Cor. viii. 4—6.) That Christianity utterly and for ever renounces all idolatry—all polytheism—in a word, every thing inconsistent with the worship of one only living and true God—is a point so plain and so universally conceded, that I shall not dwell for a moment upon it.

Were it not that I fear becoming tedious, by detailing any reasons for believing in the divine nature of Christ, I should add a great number of texts, which require us with all the heart to *love* him, to *obey* him, to *confide* in him, and to *commit ourselves* to him, in such a manner as I can never persuade myself to do, with respect to any being, who is not God. The New Testament tells me that my consolation, my privilege, my happiness, must be derived from *trusting in Christ.* But can I trust myself to a *finite being,* when I have an *infinite, almighty, all-sufficient* GOD to whom I may go? Shall I be satisfied with a mite, when I can have the mines of Peru?

I should also add those texts, some of which are very striking ones, where, in the New Testament, the very same things are applied to Christ, which, in the Old Testament, are affirmed of Jehovah. Some of these follow.

Is. vi. 5—10. Then said I, Wo is me! for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts. Then flew one of the seraphims unto me, having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar. And he laid it upon my mouth, and said, Lo, this hath touched thy lips, and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged. Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I, send me. And he said, Go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed.	John, xii. 37—41. But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him; that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them. These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory and spake of HIM.
Mal. iii. 1. Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in; behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts.	Mark, i. 2. As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.
Ps. lxxviii. 56. Yet they tempted and provoked the *most high God*, and kept not his testimonies.	1 Cor. x. 9. Neither let us tempt *Christ*, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.

It were easy to increase the number of such passages as these; but I shall desist. Instead of that want of evidence in the New Testament, with respect to the divinity of Christ, of which you repeatedly speak, and in strong terms, I find evidence almost every where to illustrate and confirm the doctrine in question.

Thus have I endeavoured to shew that the

New Testament bestows upon Christ the appellation of God, accompanied by such adjuncts as naturally, not to say necessarily, lead us to understand this word in its highest sense— that it attributes to him equality with God—that it represents him as the Creator, Preserver, and Governor of the universe; declares his omniscience, his omnipotence, and his eternity; and, both by precepts and examples, exhibits Christ as the object of prayer and divine worship, by the church in heaven and on earth. To these conclusions do the plain rules of exegesis necessarily conduct me. I am sensible that allegations are frequently made, that we receive our systems of belief from the creeds and confessions of faith, which have descended from former unenlightened and superstitious or philosophizing ages. That some of our *phraseology* has been derived from men who *sometimes* speculated too boldly, and substituted names for ideas, I am ready to concede. I feel the embarrassments that, on account of this, are occasionally thrown in the way of inculcating truth at the present time. Men are very apt to suppose that if you throw away the old *terms* or *names*, you reject the old ideas also. Yet it can be only superficial thinkers who will soberly believe this. It is in general, therefore, a sufficient reason with me for dismissing phraseology, when it must, almost of necessity, be misunderstood by the great body of men. Yet a sudden and entire revolution in the common technical terms of theology, would be very undesirable; because such a revolution must again lead, at first, to other misapprehensions. I am willing, therefore, to retain many terms, which have become venerable for their antiquity, that I should reject without hesitation, if they were now presented *de novo*.

I am not conscious of being led to the adoption of Trinitarian views, or to the ascription of true and proper divinity to Christ, by any creed or any human authority on earth. Unless I am quite ignorant of myself, the only influence which creeds and confessions exercise over me is to modify my *phraseology*. I take the language of theology as I find it; and do not venture upon the composition of a new nomenclature.

My sole business, these ten years past, has been the study of the Bible; and the study of it, in the daily use of those principles of exegesis, which you have, for the most part, so briefly and so happily described. I began this study, as I believed, with a desire to know what the Bible has taught. I have pursued it with increased desire, with unabated ardour. I have limited my studies to no one class of writers; but have solicitously endeavoured to seek for truth, and to receive it thankfully, from whatever quarter it might come. In particular, at least three quarters of my time have been spent among writers of the Unitarian class, from whom I have received, with gratitude, much instruction relative to the philology, the exegesis, and the literary history of the Scriptures. I am accustomed to reject any explanation of the Scriptures that is not founded upon the general principles of exegesis which you have developed. Whether an *orthodox* or *heterodox* use can be made of any interpretation, is what I habitually endeavour to lay out of view when I interpret the Scriptures. The simple question which I desire to place before me is, "What has God said? What has Christ taught?" I aim at being guided by the fundamental principles of explanation in all writings, when I pursue these inquiries in the Scriptures. And when I come to a satisfactory answer, I regard this as of divine authority—*as real orthodoxy*, in the highest and best sense of the word.

I do not, indeed, regard the opinions of great and good men, in past ages, as unworthy of attention, and even of reverence. If I read them with a proper temper of mind, there are few of them who may not be read with profit. The reasonings of Athanasius and Augustine, I can peruse with pleasure; so I can those of Calvin and Edwards. But I adopt no opinion because they adopted it. The *reasons* of their opinion are the object of my investigation: It is of but little interest to me, to know simply that they believed this or that doctrine. And with the very same object, I read the *opponents* of these great men. I can say with truth, that much more of my reading life has been spent among the opponents of my sentiments, than among the friends of them. Can you make the same affirmation?

After all, it is a principle by which, if I have any knowledge of my own heart, I desire for ever to be guided, to "call no man master on earth." I would place the decision of Scripture, fairly made out, IMMEASURABLY ABOVE all human opinions. I regard the one as the decision of an *unerring* GOD, the other as the opinions of *fallible men*.

It is with such views and principles of reasoning that I have come to the conclusions which have been developed in these Letters.

And now, in concluding this letter, permit me to say, that as reason does not and cannot decide against the doctrine of the Trinity, as explained in my second Letter, nor against the union of the divine and human natures in Christ, the question whether these are truths or not, rests solely on the decision of revelation. What, then, is that decision? This question I have endeavoured to answer.

I will now acknowledge, that I was induced to undertake the above examination, in consequence of the challenge which you make (p. 9.) in the following words,—"We challenge our opponents to adduce *one* passage in the New Testament, where the word *God* . . . unless turned from its usual sense by the connection, does not mean the Father." I have accepted this challenge, not, I hope, in the spirit of contest, but with the desire of contributing, so far as lies in my power, to develop what the New Testament does teach. I have laboured to shew, that the very reason, above all other reasons, why I believe Christ to be truly divine, is *because the connection, when he is called God, ascribes to him such attributes and works as leave me no room to doubt that the New Testament writers meant to assert his proper divinity.*

After stating your apprehensions in regard to the doctrine that Christ has two natures, the belief of which, you affirm, is "an enormous tax on human credulity," you say (p. 14,) "I am aware that these remarks will be met by two or three texts, in which Christ is called God, and by a class of passages not very numerous, in which divine properties are said to be ascribed to him." Whether the number of texts in which Christ is called God, amounts to no more than *two* or *three*, it would be superfluous now to inquire, when they lie before us, and can easily be counted. We can also judge whether the "class of passages" is "not very numerous, in which divine properties are said to be ascribed to him," with equal facility. It is too late, however, for you and me to rest our faith upon the *number* of passages that inculcate a doctrine. We have conceded the Bible to be of divine authority. The simple question is, what, according to the rules of interpretation in all other cases, does any passage mean? This being ascertained, only two courses are before us,—the *one*, to receive its meaning as the guide of our faith; the *other*, to reject its authority, and deny our obligation to believe the decisions of the Scripture. If the New Testament does teach that Christ is not really divine, but a finite creature, and this can be made out by an unbiassed interpretation of it, I will either receive this doctrine—receive it implicitly (for, if I am not deceived in respect to myself, I only desire to know what God has taught, in order to believe it)—or else I will reject all claims to inspiration in the sacred writers, and follow their instructions only so far as they coincide with my own speculations. I am fully satisfied that there is no middle path here; and that a man who investigates for himself, extensively and independently, must eventually follow one or the other of these courses.

Convince me, then, that you apply the principles of interpretation which you have laid down in an unbiassed manner, and that the New Testament does, according to them, clearly teach that Jesus is not, and cannot be, divine, and you will make me a convert to the doctrines (at least some of them) which you embrace. Where the apostles lead me, I will go, or else renounce all deference to them. While I have a being, also, I will cherish a grateful remembrance of any man who shall convince me, by sound reasoning, that I am in an error, and am wandering from the paths of life.

But you will allow me to say, what you will doubtless affirm of yourself, "I cannot be convinced, until I am satisfied that my principles of interpretation are wrong, and my application of them erroneous." You have described (p. 14) in what manner you avoid the conclusion drawn from those texts which call Christ *God*, and which apparently ascribe divine attributes to him. On the principles of exegesis there disclosed, I shall remark in another Letter. I will at present say only, that they appear to me far from being well established.

Your candour will easily concede, that the positions which I have just laid down are correct, and are such as become every sincere lover of truth. I am very ready to grant, that we ought not to expect to convince you and your friends by using reproachful epithets or severe appellations. We cannot convince you by appealing to our New England fathers or their creeds—to the ancient fathers of the Church, or any body of men whatever. You may always reply to us, "Are not men fallible? and have not the best of uninspired men cherished some errors? Give us the *reasons* why our fathers received the doctrines in question, and then we will hear you. The fact that they did receive them is a part of church history, but certainly no theological argument. The Papal hierarchy is supported by the fathers; and there never has been a sect in Christendom who could not, sooner or later, make an appeal to the fathers whom they respected."

Nor can we convince you, by a tenacious and unreasonable opposition to all critical examination of the New Testament, or by throwing out hints in our sermons or writings, that critical studies belong only to those who have a wish to be heretical or sceptical, or by a forced and mystical explanation of various passages of Scripture, and converting them to the support of sentiments which they never were designed to support. The sound rules of interpretation will soon sweep away every vestige of such defective opinions about the Word of God; and orthodoxy must stand or fall, by the simple decision of the Scriptures, interpreted according to the general laws of language.

On the other hand, you will as cheerfully concede, too, that we cannot be convinced by calling us hard names—by misrepresenting our sentiments—by proving that Calvin helped to burn Servetus—by affirming that our sentiments come from creeds and confessions of human authority, fabricated by superstition and philosophy—by representing us as gloomy, superstitious, malignant, and unsocial — by appropriating to Unitarians all that is kind, and noble, and generous, and exalted, and leaving to us the opposites of these virtues — by affirming that we are desirous of infringing Christian liberty, and establishing an inquisition to defend our sentiments, and exhorting others to resist such tyranny — or by representing us as admitting in words that God is kind and paternal, while we think meanly of him, and treat him as the heathen did their Jupiter. Such things may add fuel to the fire of controversy; but can the lover of truth and the Word of God be convinced by them? They are the arts, indeed, of controversialists; and arts like them, I am sorry to say, are not confined to to any one party. Passion has more control over disputants than they are aware of. Zeal for what they believe to be truth is what they think inspires them; while perhaps their words, or the spirit of their representations, "breathe out threatenings," if not "slaughter," to their opponents. I hardly dare trust myself to write this paragraph, lest I should catch the spirit while I am describing it. I know, in some measure, how frail I am; but I think I do sincerely disapprove of such a spirit, in whatever party it may be found.

In consulting writers of different views and sentiments, one is grieved to find how much of this spirit is indulged. I have seen it even in many great and good men. Possessed of feelings naturally ardent, I feel that there is reason to tremble for myself, lest I may, in some respect or other, transgress the laws of Christian propriety in these Letters, and hinder something of the conviction, in the minds of some, which they might possibly produce.

In one thing we shall certainly be agreed: The sober inquirer after truth must be convinced by reason and argument. All else is nothing to him. And where these lead him he will go. The path of truth is the path of duty. The approbation of God for a sincere, candid, honest, believing heart, is worth infinitely more than all the honour which party zeal can bestow, or the world is able to give.[7]

LETTER IV.

Reverend and Dear Sir,

In my last Letter I endeavoured to offer reasons why I believe that Christ is *truly divine.* You will very naturally expect me to take some notice of those texts on which you would specially rely, to prove his inferiority to the Father. This I must do, but in as summary a manner as possible. Not because it would not be easy to say much, even more easy than to write briefly, and yet with perspicuity; but because there would be danger of protracting the subject, and tiring the patience of both writer and reader.

Let me begin, then, by stating certain things which are intimately connected with the subject in question. While I believe that Christ is truly divine, I believe that he is as truly human — that he was a real man, and lived, acted, suffered, and died as a man. He resembled, however, man in his primitive state, that is, Adam, as he came out of the hands of his Maker. He was pure and sinless; but he possessed all the feelings and all the innocent infirmities of human nature. I know no proposition that can be proved from the New Testament, if this cannot; nor do I know of an opinion more inconsistent with the whole history of Jesus than that of the Docetæ, who averred that Christ was a man in appearance merely, and not in reality.

I regret that I am not able to find in your sermon an intimation that Christ was truly and properly a man. All that you appear to maintain is, that he was a being distinct from the Father, and inferior to him. Perhaps I must retract, therefore, my sentence against the Docetæ, lest I should seem to have treated your opinion with severity. But the state of my mind, in regard to the weight of evidence, I cannot retract. If the evidence be not overwhelming that Christ was perfectly a man, I cannot conceive it possible that any point in theology or morals is capable of being established by the language of the New Testament.

The *Gnostics* maintained, that from the supreme Divinity proceeded certain Eons, who were a kind of *lesser gods,* (*dii minores,*) and one of which (Christ) created the world. This Eon descended upon Jesus at his baptism, and forsook him at his crucifixion. In what important respect that opinion differs from this, which holds that Christ had a super-angelic soul united to a human body, I confess I cannot see. The Socinian theory seems to me incomparably more rational and more tenable than any shade of the Arian hypothesis. If the evidence be not complete that Christ was really a man from his birth, actions, sufferings, death, and affirmations respecting himself, then how is it to be proved that Christ ever existed at all? And will any one refuse his assent to the proposition, that Christ possessed a divine nature, because he cannot see *how* a union of the divine and human natures could take place, and yet believe that *a human body was united to a soul not human?* To what order or class of beings, then, does this new *compound* and strangely mixed person belong? He is not divine — he is not human, for a human soul is surely *essential* to human nature — nor is he angelic, for angels have no corporeal forms. Are we to be freed from *mystery,* then, by such a theory?

---

[7] See Appendix, for Postscript to Letter III.

It seems to me, if there be mystery in any theory which has ever been proposed respecting the person of Christ, it may surely be found here. I will not say (as you do about the twofold nature of Christ, in which we believe) that "it is an enormous tax upon human credulity," but I can say, that it appears to me as much like such a tax as any theory with which the Church has hitherto been agitated. I can never bring myself to view it as probable, in any degree, unless I find it in the Scriptures. But there I find that the *Logos*, who existed before the world was made, was *God — that God who created the universe.* I cannot, then, admit him to be a super-angelic being simply, until I am convinced either that John was mistaken, or that his language has a different meaning from that which it appears to have.

As to the theory which maintains that Christ was God's *own proper* Son, before the creation of the world, (of course before his incarnation,) and God's own Son in the same sense, or in as real and proper a sense as Solomon was the son of David, it is natural to ask, first, Who, then, was his *mother?* and, secondly, How much does such a theory of divinities in the Christian system differ from that which admitted a Jupiter and his progeny to be gods among the Greeks and Romans?

We do, then, (if you will allow me to use your own expressive words, though applied by you in a connection somewhat different,) "we do maintain, that the human properties and circumstances of Christ, his birth, sufferings, and death, his praying to God, his ascribing to God all his power and offices, — the acknowledged properties of Christ, we say, *oblige* us to interpret" them of *human nature;* and to draw the conclusion, that, whatever could be predicated of a real man, pious and sinless, might be predicated of him. How would he — how *could* he — have assumed our nature, (except as the Docetæ affirmed that he did, namely, in *appearance* only,) unless every thing could be predicated of him which properly belongs to man? Accordingly we know that he increased in wisdom, stature, and favour with God and man, that he ate, drank, slept, laboured, was fatigued, hungry, thirsty, rejoiced and sympathized with his brethren, wept, was in agony, prayed, bled, died, was buried, and rose again. If these things do not for ever exclude all hope of making any shade of the Arian theory probable, I must confess myself a stranger to the nature of evidence, and to what the New Testament contains.

To return to my purpose. The proper humanity of Christ being considered as an established fact, I have one general observation to make on the principles of exegesis, which are connected with it.

It is this: That inasmuch as Christ has truly a human nature, every thing said of him in respect to this nature must necessarily be spoken of him in a capacity in which he is inferior to the Father. In a word, as his human nature is inferior to the divine, so, whatever has relation to it, or is predicated of it, must, of course, be that which implies inferiority to the divine.

Do you ask me, How you shall distinguish when a text speaks of Christ in respect to his human nature, or in respect to his divine nature? I answer, Just as when you speak of a man, you distinguish whether what is said relates to his body or his soul. When I say Abraham is *dead*, I mean, obviously, his *mortal* part. When I say Abraham is *alive*, I mean, obviously, his *immortal* part. When the evangelist says that Jesus increased in stature and wisdom, and in favour with God and man, — that he ate, drank, slept, prayed, suffered, died, and rose again, — he obviously means that his human nature did this. When he affirms that the *Logos* is God, and made the universe, and when Paul says that he is "supreme God, blessed for ever," I cannot help thinking it to be equally obvious, that they predicate this of his divine nature. The simple answer to your question, then, is, that we must determine which nature is described, by what is affirmed concerning it. *The subject is known by its predicates.*

To the remarks just made on the proper humanity of Christ, and the principles of exegesis which result from it, let me add,

Secondly, That the appellation *Father* is not always used to designate that distinction in the Godhead, which we commonly describe by calling it *the first person;* but that it is sometimes a general title of the divine nature. (See Deut. xxxii. 6. Is. lxiii. 16; lxiv. 3. Matt. v. 16, 48; vi. 4; vii. 11. John, viii. 41.) In the same manner (Κυριος) *Lord* is applied often to Christ in particular, and to God as a general appellation. The Divinity is called *Father*, on account of that peculiar and provident care which he extends to all the creatures of his power. He is called *Lord* (Κυριος) because of his universal dominion.

Proper attention to this obvious principle will explain several passages, which have been thought to relate merely to what is denominated the first person in the Trinity; and to ascribe properties to him in an exclusive manner.

Thirdly, There is another observation which I cannot refrain from making here, and which seems to me of great importance, in regard to our mode of thinking and reasoning on the subject of the distinction in the Godhead. This is, that no terms, which are applied by the Scriptures to designate this distinction, or to predicate any thing of it, can be supposed *fully* and *definitely* to express what exists in the Godhead, or what is done by it. The obvious reason of this is, that the language of men (being all formed from perceptions of finite objects, by beings who are of yesterday, and whose sphere of knowledge is extremely limited) cannot possibly be adequate to express *fully* and *definitely* what pertains to the self-existent and infinite God. How often do men forget this in their reasonings about the Deity! In some things nearly all men agree in observing caution with regard to language which is applied to God. When the Scripture speaks of his having eyes, ears, hands, feet, &c. all men of a sound mind understand these terms as figurative; for the obvious reason that "God is a Spirit," and that things of this nature can be literally predicated only of human beings that have flesh and blood. We mean to say, God *sees*, God *hears*, God *moves*, &c. when we attribute to him those members which we employ in performing such actions. And still, this is only the language of *approximation* to full description. What corresponds in the infinite, omniscient, omnipresent Spirit, to our *seeing*, and *hearing*, and *moving*, &c. must necessarily be different, in many important respects, from all these things in us.

When we say, "God is in heaven; the Lord looked down, or came down, from heaven; Jehovah sits upon a throne high and lifted up,"—or when we predicate any thing of him, which corresponds to the exaltation and magnificence of earthly monarchs, — we understand, of course, that this language is not to be taken literally, and as being fully adequate to the description aimed at, but only as that of approximation. When we say "God is angry; God hates; God scorns; the Lord will deride, will laugh, will frown, will abhor," &c. do we predicate all these things of God in a literal manner, or do we understand them all as conveying to us an idea of something in the divine affections, actions, or mode of treating us, which corresponds to something that is in men, or which they do? The answer is very obvious; and in all this use of language, we apprehend or feel little or no difficulty. At least, none but enthusiastic visionaries, who would fain make heaven like earth, and God like themselves; or ignorant men, whose thoughts are so chained down to objects of sense, as to be incapable of elevation above them, are embarrassed by such expressions, or substantially misapprehend them.

Are we not now prepared to advance one step farther? May we not say, when the Scripture speaks of the *Logos* as becoming flesh and dwelling among us — of his dwelling in the bosom of the Father — of his coming from God, and being sent of him — of his humbling himself and taking upon himself the condition of a servant, and other things of a like nature, — that we are not to suppose this language is adequate to describe, *fully* and *definitely*, the incarnation of the Logos, or his distinction from, or connection with, the Father? If I may be allowed so to express myself, *it is all language of approximation.* It is so of course, and necessarily, as it regards any description of the *manner* of these things. Language, from its very nature, must be inadequate to such description. It was not formed with such facts in view; and finite beings, with knowledge so limited as ours, may well be supposed incapable of forming it, so as to be adequate to the full and definite description of what pertains to the Divinity. I may, nevertheless, express enough to excite our highest interest, and to command our best obedience, if we feel and act as rational beings. And so much is undoubtedly accomplished in the case which has just been stated.

The principle of exegesis here exhibited, had it been early acknowledged, and generally regarded in practice, would have saved the world much dispute, and two classes of men, in particular, much trouble. The one of these are men who, while admitting the inadequacy of language, in other respects, fully and definitely to describe the Divinity, have taken it for granted here, that no such inadequateness was to be found, and have sought to define and distinguish, until they have overwhelmed themselves and their readers with subtleties too tenuous for comprehension. The other, hostile to the doctrine of a distinction in the Godhead, have forced upon the expressions in question a sense that was far-fetched, and which violence only could make them to speak. It seems to me, that the path of sound reason and common sense is the medium between these two extremes. I would not do violence to the expressions in question, nor would I understand them as *fully* and *definitely* describing what does exist in God, or is done by him. I believe they are the *language of approximation;* that they signify something which is in God, or something that has been done by him, that corresponds to those things among men, which would be described by similar language — something of the highest interest, of the deepest moment to the welfare of the human race. And though it might gratify my curiosity, and perhaps my pride, to know something more of the divine constitution, or mode of existing and acting, yet I can have no assurance, no good reason to believe, that it would contribute at present to facilitate my duties or increase my happiness. I certainly have no good reason to suppose, that, in the present state, I am capable of understanding such subjects, beyond what is already revealed respecting them.

Fourthly, The attentive observer cannot but notice, that whether we contemplate God in his works or in his word, we cannot fail of finding things which are beyond our comprehension or power of explanation. The book of nature and of revelation, so far as they bring to view the being, character, and designs of the self-existent and infinite God, who created and governs the world, must contain many passages, of the meaning of which we can never obtain more than a general and imperfect knowledge. "We know but in part."

In offering, then, to the mind, a view of what God is, and what he has done, we do not expect (at least we cannot reasonably expect) that this view should be all light, without any shade. Admitting that the Scriptures are of divine origin and authority, the question between us and Unitarians, in respect to what is revealed about the divine Being, is not whether the view which we suppose the Bible gives is embarrassed by no obscurities—is without a shade—or whether theirs is such. The proper question is, Taking it for granted that what the Scriptures declare is true, which view, on the whole, comports best with the language of the sacred writings?—which is attended with the least embarrassment, all things considered? I well know, that a moderate portion of sagacity will suffice to enable any one to press many questions upon Trinitarians, that are of difficult solution—many of which are, in our present state, incapable of any solution. But I believe that the same degree of sagacity would enable one to raise more formidable difficulties still in the way of Unitarian sentiments.

In expounding texts of Scripture, therefore, which relate to the present subject in dispute, I am not very solicitous to give an interpretation which shall be above all question or embarrassment, whenever it appears to me that a different or contrary exposition will be attended with still greater embarrassments.

With the preceding observations before us, let me proceed to remark on some of the New Testament representations of Christ, which have been supposed to present difficulties in regard to the views that Trinitarians defend.

Christ, in his mediatorial capacity, is, as I apprehend, ever to be regarded as that complex person who may be described as human or divine,—in like manner as we may say of ourselves, we are *mortal* or *immortal*. As Mediator then, it may be truly said, that by his obedience he merited and obtained a high reward, that is, this is predicated of that nature which was capable of obeying, and of being rewarded. So God is said to have "highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name," (Phil. ii. 9—11.) In a similar way, all power is *given* him in heaven and in earth; that is, he is constituted "head over all things to his Church," (Mat. xxviii. 18.) Acting as such a head, "all enemies are put under his feet," (1 Cor. xv. 25—27.) And this mediatorial dominion, when the work of a mediator is completed, will be resigned at the final judgment, (1 Cor. xv. 28.)

Of the same tenor are many passages. When God is said to be the head of Christ, (1 Cor. xi. 3,) I understand it of that nature, of which this can be predicated. When Christ is called the image of the invisible God, the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image (χαρακτηρ) of his person, that is, of him; or the only begotten of the Father, the Son of God, God's own Son, God's beloved Son, his dear Son, &c. I understand all these as descriptions of his mediatorial nature and station. I know, indeed, that many of these texts have been appropriated by some Trinitarians to prove the divine nature of Christ—in my apprehension, however, injudiciously, and without any solid reason. Texts of this class may be found, Mat. xvii. 5; John, i. 14; x. 36; xiv. 10; iii. 35; Col. i. 13; Heb. i. 5; Rom. viii. 29, 32.

In Heb. v. 7—10, is a passage which has occasioned much speculation,—"Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared: Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him; called of God an high priest, after the order of Melchisedec."

If Christ had really a *human* nature, what is more perfectly consonant with reason and piety, than that he should act in the manner here described; or than that he should be exalted to glory, as the reward of these actions, and be constituted the Saviour of his people?

It is certainly more difficult to satisfy the mind in regard to John, xiv. 28,—"My Father is greater (μειζων) than I." On examination, however, it appears not to be the object of Christ to compare his own *nature* with that of the Father, but his *condition.* "If ye loved me," said he to his weeping disciples, "ye would rejoice that I said, I go unto the Father; for the Father is greater than I;" that is, ye would rejoice that I am to leave this state of suffering and humiliation, and resume that "glory which I had with the Father before the world was." You ought to rejoice at my exaltation to bliss and glory with the Father. So, in Hebrew, *great* is used for a state of prosperity, a happy state, Gen. xxvi. 13.

It is obvious here, that the whole text cannot be consistently explained without the supposition of two natures,—the one which suffers and is depressed, in which, too, that other nature acts, that was in a state of glory with the Father before the world was, that is, from eternity. I cannot at all accede to the opinion of those interpreters, who suppose that the glory here spoken of is only that which the Father had *decreed* from eternity that Christ should have, in consequence of the promulgation of the Gospel by him. The glory spoken of is not one that will result from what is to be done—it is a glory, that is, a happiness or blessedness, *which Christ had with the Father,* (προς τον πατερα) *before the world was.* On this passage the commentary of Kuinoel may be consulted, who has defended this exposition, as it seems to me, in a manner entirely unanswerable.

After all, it can be only in consequence of the peculiar union of the *Logos* with Jesus, that his *return to the Father* (so far as the *Logos* can be said to return) can be spoken of; and only in reference to his humiliation[8] that his *return* to glory can be expected. A thousand questions can easily be raised, and as many difficulties suggested; but they all spring from construing the language literally, and not merely as language which must, from the nature of the case, be that of *approximation.*

Mark, xiii. 32, offers serious difficulties. "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." The *day* and *hour* are, according to some, the day of judgment; but, as I apprehend (from comparing the context,) the day of vengeance to the Jews is meant. To solve the difficulty presented, some have objected to the reading ουδε ὁ ὑιος, (neither the Son;) but, to support this objection, there are no adequate authorities. Others, with Hilary (de Trinitate, ix.) say, that *not to know* is *not to publish or declare.* "Ea nescit, quæ aut in tempore non sunt confitenda, aut non agnoscuntur ad meritum." There is no doubt that the verb γινωσκω (*to know*) sometimes has the sense of *making known;* but a derivative of the verb ἐιδω (video, *to see*) is used here, which does not bear such a sense; nor will the tenor of the verse admit it. To say, "That day and hour no man *maketh known*, neither the angels, nor the Son, but the Father," would be the same as saying that the Father *does make it known.* But where has he revealed it? After all, what more real difficulty presents itself in this case than in that where Jesus is said to have increased in wisdom? Luke, ii. 52. If he did possess a nature really human, that nature was capable, of course, of progressive improvement and knowledge. And there is no proper method, as it appears to me, of solving the difficulty, as the text stands, but by appropriating, as in other cases, the expression to that nature of which the assertion made can be predicated.

John, xvii. 3, "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." The *true God* here seems to me plainly not opposed to or contrasted with Christ; but, as everywhere else, in case this expression is used, *opposed to idols.* In the verse preceding, Christ says, "Thou hast given me power over ALL *flesh*, that thou mightest bestow eternal life upon ALL whom thou hast given me," that is, both Jews and Gentiles. He proceeds,—"This is eternal life, that they might know thee, the only true God (*the only God and true God*, the Greek is capable of being rendered as to sense,) and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Now, what is there here different from that which we preach and inculcate every Sabbath? Do we not teach that there is one only living and true God? And that he sent his Son to die for sinners? And do we not insist that eternal life is connected with the reception of these truths? I really see no more difficulty here than in the text, "God so loved the world, that he sent his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life."

1 Cor. viii. 4—6, "As concerning, therefore, the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or earth, (as there be gods many and lords many,) but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him: and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." I have cited several verses for the sake of introducing the context. From this it is plain that the one God, the Father, is not here placed in opposition to Christ, but to the *lords many and gods many* of the heathen. If you insist that the *one God* is in opposition to *Christ,* or excludes him, then, for the same reason as Christ is the *one Lord,* (ἑις Κυριος,) you must insist that it is in opposition to the *Lordship* (Κυριοτης) of the Father; and of course denies the *Lordship* of creation to him. It is plain, however, according to my apprehension, that *God* and *Lord* here are mere synonymes. (See verse 5th, where λεγομενοι Θεοι is explained by Θεοι πολλοι and Κυριοι πολλοι.) Nothing is plainer than that Κυριος is a common title of God in the Old Testament and the New.

Moreover, what is predicated of the *one God* and *one Lord* here, is the same,—namely, they are the Author and Preserver of all things. The use of the preposition δια, in cases of this nature, has already been the subject of remark.

The nature of the whole case shews that the apostle places the object of the Christian's worship in opposition to the heathen or idol gods. What, then, is that object? The one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ;

---

[8] Ἑαυτον ἐκενωσε, ἑαυτον ἐταπεινωσε, "He made himself void, he humbled himself."

for whom are all things, and by whom are all things. The passage evidently holds out Christ to be, in the same manner, the object of the Christian's worship as the Father is. And, as the apostle seems to me simply to assert the unity of God, in opposition to idols, I am not able to perceive how the divinity of the Saviour is impeached by it any more than the Lordship of the Father is impeached by making Christ the *one Lord.* To embrace my view of the whole passage in a brief paraphrase : "Idols are nothing—there is but one God. There are indeed among the heathen such as are *called gods* (λεγομενοι Θεοι,) who comprise *gods* and *lords* many ; yet Christians have only one object of worship — one God and Lord."

John, x. 35, 36, "If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken ; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?" Christ had previously said, "I and my Father are one." At this the Jews took up stones to stone him, "because, being a man, he made himself God." It is perfectly clear that the Jews frequently understood, or pretended to understand, his affirmations respecting himself, as amounting to assertions that he was truly divine. In this case, however, it is said that Jesus repelled such an interpretation of his words by an explanation which shews, that he applied to himself the word *God* only in an inferior sense.

I am not satisfied that the passage requires this exegesis. The reply of Jesus is evidently *argumentum ad hominem.* "If the Old Testament (the divine authority of which you admit) calls them *gods*, to whom the word of God was addressed, (Ps. lxxxii. 6,) that is, if it call the magistrates of the Jews *gods*, is it not proper that I, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, should call myself the *Son of God?* If you are not offended when your Scriptures bestow the title of *Elohim* upon civil magistrates merely, much less is there reason to be angry when I, whom God hath distinguished from all others, made pre-eminent above them, and sent into the world on the designs of mercy, should call myself the *Son of God.* Verse 37,—If I prove not the truth of these assertions by miracles, then disbelieve them. Verse 38,—But, if I do, believe the proof that may be drawn from my miracles, *that the Father is in me, and I in him.*" Now, wherein did Jesus explain away any thing which he had before said? The expression, *that the Father is in him and he in the Father*, I do not understand as asserting his divine nature in a direct manner. It is a phrase which is used to express the idea that any one is (*conjunctissimus Deo*) *most nearly and affectionately united with God.* (See 1 John, iv. 16, where it is applied to Christians ; also verses 12 and 13.)

In the whole passage it appears plain to me, that Jesus has not asserted any thing which could not be predicated of himself as sustaining the office of Messiah. He had called God *his Father*, and, as the Jews supposed, or seem to have supposed, in a peculiar and appropriate sense. But it did not follow that by using this term he meant to assert his divine nature. Rather the contrary appears. "Say ye of him whom the Father *hath sanctified and sent into the world*," that is, the Son of God, &c. Jesus does not undertake, then, to answer the question here whether he is truly divine, but simply to vindicate the language he had used against the accusations of the Jews. "If your magistrates are called *Elohim*, is it presumption in me to call myself the *Son of God?*" This leaves the question unagitated as to his divine nature, but vindicates the language which he had used against the malignant aspersions of the Jews, by an argument drawn from their own Scriptures.

It shews, indeed, that the term "Son of God" does not *appropriately* designate Christ as divine, but as the incarnate Mediator — as him *whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world.* Did the Father *sanctify* and *send into the world* his *Son* as GOD, who is infinitely perfect and immutable? As Mediator, as Messiah, Christ was sent into the world—as *Son* he filled, and acted in a subordinate capacity—how, then, can his being *Son* prove him to be divine? *Son of God* indeed, by usage, has become a kind of *proper name ;* and, in this view, designates occasionally a distinction in the Godhead, which I believe to be eternal. In this manner we very commonly use the term now ; and in this way the Apostles sometimes use it. (See Heb. i. 1—3.) But this is, in Scripture, only an *occasional* and *secondary* use of it. *Commonly* and *appropriately*, it designates the incarnate Messiah as born in a manner supernatural, (Luke, i. 35, compare iii. 38,) as the special object of divine love, (Matt. xvii. 5 ; Col. i. 13 ; John, iii. 35,) and as exhibiting the best and highest resemblance of the Father, (Col. i. 15 ; Heb. i. 3 ; John, i. 14 ; x. 38 ; xiv. 10.) Would theologians keep these ideas in view, I cannot help thinking they might be able to understand each other better, and to reason more conclusively.

I have thus summarily touched upon the principal texts, which are employed by Unitarians to oppose the doctrines which I have been endeavouring to defend. Whether I have violated the laws of exegesis in doing this, and whether you or I most depart from them, in explaining the texts which seem to be at variance with the opinions that we defend, must be left to the judgment of the intelligent reader.

I must observe, however, before I close this Letter, which concludes what I have at present to advance in respect to your sermon, that I do not omit making observations on the rest of the sermon, because I accede to many things which you profess to believe, or to the mode in which you have represented the sentiments of Trinitarians, in regard to various topics. I might mention the manner in which you accuse us of treating the moral attributes of God; your appropriating to yourself and your party, by implication, the exclusive belief in all that is amiable and excellent in the Deity, (pp. 15—18;) your assertion, that the reproaches which you are obliged to encounter are occasioned chiefly by your zeal to vindicate the dishonoured goodness and rectitude of God, (p. 18;) the manner in which you state our views of the atonement, and by implication appropriate to Unitarians only, many important things in which we all agree, (pp. 18—21;) the appropriation also to Unitarians only, in a similar way, of many views respecting the love of God, rational zeal in religion, and the benevolent virtues; and the intimations that we are opposed to all that is excellent, and rational, and worthy of belief. The manner in which you have treated these topics, I do very much regret; and I cannot think that this is the way to convince opponents, or to terminate disputes. If I have attempted to hold up you, or Unitarians, to ridicule — if I have misrepresented your sentiments — made any effort to use the *argumentum ad invidiam*— appealed to human authorities to decide the question between us — or appealed to any thing but the sober rules of exegesis — then I desire to know it, and be humbled for it. I will not say that I have not transgressed in any of these particulars; for who that knows the human heart does not know that it is deceitful? But I can say, sincerely, I did not mean to transgress; and that I will with all my heart, thank the man who, in the spirit of Christian love, will point out my error, and shew me wherein I have written in such a way as to endanger or render repulsive the cause which I am advocating. That cause I believe to be just; and I should regret to employ any unfairness to defend it. What real interest have we but to know the truth? And what but simple argument can lead us to it?

I retire, then, from the field of review which the remainder of your sermon presents; for, since the pressure of my official duties, that cannot be abandoned or neglected, is so great, I am compelled to relinquish the idea, which I at first entertained, of pursuing the investigation of the topics presented by the remainder of your sermon.

I have but a few considerations to add, on the subject of the preceding pages; which must be reserved for another Letter.

LETTER V.

Reverend and Dear Sir,

In page 14th of your sermon, you inform us of the method in which you explain those passages which seem to speak of the divine nature of Christ. The paragraph is as follows:—

> "I am aware, that these remarks will be met by two or three texts, in which Christ is called God, and by a class of passages, not very numerous, in which divine properties are said to be ascribed to him. To these we offer one plain answer. We say, that it is one of the most established and obvious principles of criticism, that language is to be explained according to the known properties of the subject to which it is applied. Every man knows, that the same words convey very different ideas, when used in relation to different beings. Thus, Solomon *built* the temple in a different manner from the architect whom he employed; and God *repents* differently from man. Now, we maintain, that the known properties and circumstances of Christ, his birth, sufferings, and death, his constant habit of speaking of God as a distinct being from himself, his praying to God, his ascribing to God all his power and offices,—these acknowledged properties of Christ, we say, oblige us to interpret the comparatively few passages, which are thought to make him the supreme God, in a manner consistent with his distinct and inferior nature. It is our duty to explain such texts, by the rule which we apply to other texts, in which human beings are called gods, and are said to be partakers of the divine nature, to know and possess all things, and to be filled with all God's fulness. These latter passages we do not hesitate to modify, and restrain, and turn from the most obvious sense, because this sense is opposed to the known properties of the beings to whom they relate; and we maintain that we adhere to the same principle, and use no greater latitude, in explaining, as we do, the passages which are thought to support the Godhead of Christ."

I must *hesitate*, however, to adopt this principle, without examing its nature and tendency. On the supposition that you admit the Bible to be a revelation from God, as you aver, permit me to ask, whether it is the object of a revelation to disclose truths which *are* NOT *known*, or are insufficiently established, or whether it is the object of a revelation to disclose truths *already known* and established? If you answer, The latter; then your answer denies, of course, that it is a *revelation*. What the book of nature exhibits, the Scriptures do not *reveal*. Is there, then, any thing in the Scriptures, which the book of nature does not exhibit? If you concede this, then I ask, How are we, on your ground, to obtain any notion of that thing which was *unknown* before it was *revealed?*—*e. g.* the resurrection of the body is revealed. Now, it is a *known* property of the human body to corrupt and perish. Shall I construe a passage of Scripture, then, in such a manner as to contradict this *known* property? If not, then I can never suppose the resurrection of the body to be revealed. I, however, do construe the Scriptures so as to contradict this apparently known property of the human body—following the obvious assertion of the sacred writers, and not allowing myself to force a constructive meaning upon their language. Yet, if I understand you, I am at liberty "to restrain, and modify, and turn the words from their most obvious sense," because this sense is opposed to the known properties of the matter of which our bodies are composed.

The case is just the same in regard to any other fact or doctrine. What I know already of a thing is, if you are correct, "to modify, and restrain, and turn from their obvious sense," the words which are employed in revealing it, because what is revealed I suppose to be at variance with some *known* doctrines or properties. Is there not room here for great caution, and great doubt as to the correctness of your principle?

According to this principle, moreover, the Scriptures may be construed very differently by persons of different degrees of knowledge. One man knows the properties of things far more extensively than his neighbour. He sees that what is revealed may consist with *known properties* of things; but his neighbour, who lacks this knowledge, is unable to perceive the consistency of revelation with what he knows; and this, because his knowledge does not qualify him to judge, or because what he thinks he knows, he is really ignorant of. The same text in the Bible, therefore, may be received by one, as a consistent part of revelation, and rejected by the other. The measure of a man's knowledge, consequently, cannot be a proper test by which the meaning of Scripture is to be proved.

But you will say, "I can never believe in the reality of a revelation which contradicts my reason." I accede. And here is the very place where I find the greatest difficulty with your theory of interpretation. You do not seem to me to carry your objections back to the proper place. If *God manifest in the flesh* be an absurdity, a palpable contradiction, "an enormous tax upon human credulity," as you aver, then the claims of the book which asserts this are no doubt to be disregarded. What is palpable contradiction we certainly can never believe.

But, in determining what the Scriptures have taught, we have no right to say, that because any particular doctrine is repugnant to our views, therefore we will "modify, and restrain, and turn from their obvious sense," the words in which it is conveyed. The rules of exegesis are not a mass of wax, which can be moulded at pleasure into any shape that we may fancy. We do as great violence to reason—to the first principles of all reasoning—when we reject these rules, as when we admit absurdities to be true.

In case an obscure term is used, I acknowledge that clear passages relating to the same subject are to be adduced to ascertain its meaning. If Christ had been simply called *God*, I should allow that this term *might* be explained by its use as applied to inferior beings. But when the sacred writers themselves have explained the meaning which they attach to it, by telling us that Christ is the God who created and governs the world, who is omniscient and eternal, the object of religious worship and prayer, God over all, or supreme God, (not to mention the "true God," and the "great God,")—there is no law of exegesis, no method of interpretation, which can obscure their meaning, that is not violence, an infringement of the fundamental principles of interpretation, and therefore an abandonment of the first principles of our reason. It does appear to me, therefore, that my only resource in such a case is, to reject their authority if I disbelieve the doctrine. To say that they did not mean to teach what they most obviously have taught, I *cannot*—*must* not; no book can be understood, no writer can be interpreted at all, by such a rule of exegesis, without forcing upon him the opinions of his readers. My system of philosophy, we will say, differs from yours. What you view to be a palpable contradiction and absurdity, I view as rational and consistent. This, we know, is not an uncommon fact. In reading a book, then, that respects the subject of our differing opinions, you hold yourself bound to construe it, so as to save all that appears to you contradictory and absurd: I interpret it just as its language obviously means, by the common laws of exegesis, which do not depend on my philosophy. This book, then, may have two different meanings, according to us, in the same passages. Is it so? *Can it be?* Or rather, are not the laws of interpretation independent of you or me? If not, how can the meaning of any writer be ever obtained?

You and I differ as to what John has taught in the first chapter of his gospel. I commence reading him with the full conviction that I cannot determine *a priori*, in all respects, what the nature of God and Christ is, and with the belief that John wrote what is a revelation from heaven. I read John, and interpret him just as I do any other author, ancient or modern, by the general rules of exegesis, modified by the special circumstances and dialect in which he wrote. I am as well satisfied that he meant to assert the truly divine nature of the *Logos*, as I am that he has made any assertion at all. I receive this assertion, therefore, as declaring a fact which I ought to believe, and which, if I admit his inspiration, I must believe. In the same manner I treat all other passages which respect this subject. I come in this way to the conclusion, that Christ is truly divine, that he has a human and divine nature so united, (I undertake not to tell in what manner,) that he speaks of either nature as himself. The passages which seem to imply his inferiority to God, I find to be capable of explanation without contradiction, or doing violence to the language, by the obvious fact, that he has two natures united, which the sacred writers seem to me so plainly to inculcate. In this way, I find one consistent whole. I save the laws of exegesis. I admit, indeed, on the authority of revelation, doctrines which natural religion never taught; but *why should not a revelation teach something which natural religion did not?*

Here, then, I take my stand. *I abide by the simple declarations of the New Testament writers, interpreted by the common laws of language.* My views reconcile all the seeming discrepancies of description in regard to Christ, without doing violence to the language of any. I can believe, and do believe, that the sacred writers are consistent, without any explanation but such as the laws of interpretation admit and require.

On the other hand, when you read the first of John, you say, The known properties of Christ must modify the description. How, then, are those properties *known?* By the same writer, the same authority, the same revelation. But what can give to one part of John's book any more credit than to the other part? You will say you can understand better how Christ can be inferior to God, than how he can be divine. Granting this might be the case, is a revelation merely to teach us things which are obvious? or may it disclose those which are most difficult, and cannot be discovered by unassisted reason? If the latter, how can you aver that Christ may not be revealed as a divine person? To shew *a priori* that this is impossible or absurd, is really out of the question. The religion of nature teaches nothing for or against this fact. The simple question then is, What has John said? not what your philosophy may lead you to regard as probable or improbable. And I must be allowed to say again, if John has not taught us that Christ is truly divine, I am utterly unable, by the laws of exegesis, to make out that he has asserted any thing in his whole gospel.

If I believed, then, as you do, that a Saviour with a human and divine nature is "an enormous tax on human credulity," I should certainly reject the authority of John. To violate the laws of exegesis, in order to save his credit, I could regard, with my present views, as nothing more than striving to keep up a fictitious belief in divine revelation. It is what I cannot do, and what no man ought to do. It would be impossible for me, with your views, to hesitate at all about giving up entirely the old idea of the divine inspiration and authority of the sacred books. How can they be divine if they teach palpable absurdities? And that they do teach what you call palpable absurdities, I feel quite satisfied can be amply proved from the simple application of the laws of interpretation.

You have, however, undertaken to vindicate your method of construing the Scriptures, by intimating the necessity of interpreting several seemingly unlimited assertions, in respect to *Christians*, in the same way as you do many in respect to Christ. "Recollect," you say, "the unqualified manner in which it is said of Christians, that they possess all things, know all things, and do all things." And again, in order to shew how we may "modify, and restrain, and turn from the obvious sense," the passages that respect the divinity of Christ, you say, "It is our duty to explain such texts, by the rule which we apply to other texts, in which human beings are called gods, and are said to be partakers of the divine nature, to know and possess all things, and to be filled with all God's fulness."

I have already examined the manner in which the Bible calls men *gods*. There is, and can be, no mistake here; for instead of attributing to them divine attributes, it always accompanies the appellations with such adjuncts as guard against mistake. It does not call any man *God;* and then add, that the *God* is meant who is the Creator of the universe.

Nor does the New Testament any where call *men God.* Will you produce the instance, unless it be in the case of Christ, which is the case in question? But that the appellation here is bestowed under circumstances totally diverse from those in which it is applied to men in the Old Testament, is a fact too obvious to need farther explanation. The Hebrew word *Elohim* had plainly a latitude more extensive, that is, it was capable of a greater variety of use than the Greek word Θεος, (*Theos* — God.) Can you produce from the Greek Scripture, that is, the New Testament, an instance where Θεος is applied to any *man* whatever?

In regard to the assertion, "that Christians are made partakers of the divine nature," (2 Pet. i. 4,) a mistake about the meaning is scarcely possible. "Whereby (that is, by the Gospel) are given unto us," says the apostle, "exceeding great and precious promises, that BY THESE ye might be *partakers of the divine nature.*" But how? He answers this question. "Having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust." That is, by moral purification you will become assimilated to God, or partakers of that holy nature which he possesses. Does the context here afford any ground for mistake?

In 1 John, ii. 20, Christians are said to have "an unction from the Holy One, and *to know all things*." In the preceding verse, the apostle had been describing apostates who forsook the Christian cause because they were not sincerely attached to it. The case of real Christians, who have an unction from the Holy One, is different. They "know all things." And what means this? The sequel explains it. "I have not written unto you," says he, "because *ye know not the truth;* but because *ye know it*, and that no lie is of the truth." To "know all things," then, plainly means here, to know all that pertains to Christian doctrine and duty, so as to persevere, and not to apostatize from the truth, as others had done.

Is this, however, asserting (as you affirm in your Sermon) in "*an unqualified manner*, that Christians know all things?"

In John xiv. 26, the Holy Ghost is promised to the apostles, "*to teach them all things*, and to bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever Christ had said to them." Again, John, xvi. 13, the "Spirit of truth is promised to guide the disciples *into all truth;* and in 1 John, ii. 27, the anointing which Christians have received, is said to "teach them all things." In all these cases, the context leaves no room to doubt that "all things essential to Christian doctrine and practice" is meant.

No person, I presume, ever understood these passages as meaning that the apostles or Christians should be endowed with omniscience.

Yet, in the other case, where Christ is asserted to be *God*, the context is such, that the great body of Christians, in every age, have understood the sacred writers as asserting that he was truly divine. Is there no difference between the two cases? You make them indeed the same, in respect to the principle of interpretation. To my mind the difference is this,—that in the one case, the adjuncts *prevent* you from ascribing omniscience to Christians; in the other, they *lead you necessarily to ascribe divine properties to Christ*, unless you "turn their meaning from the obvious sense," so far as to transgress the fundamental maxims of interpreting language.

In 1 Cor. iii. 22, the apostle says to the Corinthian churches, "All things are yours;" and the same apostle speaks of himself (2 Cor. vi. 10) as "having nothing, yet *possessing all things*." In the first case the context adds, "Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come—all are yours, and ye are Christ's,"—that is, simply, (when the phraseology is construed as elsewhere,) let no man glory in this or that particular teacher; all teachers belong to the Church; and all things in the present and future world will minister to the good of the Church. Why should you covet exclusive individual possessions, when you have an interest in the whole? Refrain, therefore, from the spirit of jealousy and contention.

The second case is merely antithesis. The apostle evidently asserts, (compare the context,) that although he has little indeed of this world's good, yet he possesses a far more excellent and satisfactory good, in comparison of which all else is nothing. In the same sense, we every day speak of a man's *all*, meaning that which he most desires and loves best.

I can no more see here, than in the other instances already discussed, why you should affirm that Christians are said, "in an *unqualified* manner, to possess all things."

One expression still remains. In Eph. iii. 19, the apostle exhibits his fervent wishes that the Christians of Ephesus might "be filled with all the fulness of God." By comparing this expression, as applied to Christ in Col. i. 19, ii. 9, with John, i. 14, 16, and Eph. i. 23, it appears evident, that, by the *fulness of God*, is meant the abundant gifts and graces which were bestowed on Christ, and through him upon his disciples—John, i. 16; Eph. i. 23. When Paul prays, therefore, that the Church at Ephesus might be "filled with the fulness of God," he prays simply that they might be abundantly replenished with the gifts and graces peculiar to the Christian religion. But how does such an affirmation concern the principle of exegesis in question?

I am well satisfied, that the course of reasoning in which you have embarked, and the principle now in question, by which you explain away the divinity of the Saviour, must lead most men who approve of them eventually to the conclusion, that the Bible is not of divine origin, and does not oblige us to belief or obedience. I do not aver that they will lead you there. You have more serious views of the importance of religion than many, perhaps, of those who speculate with you. Consistency with your present views will afford strong inducement not to give up the divine authority of the Scriptures. But are there not some who embrace Unitarian sentiments, that have no inconsistency to fear, by adopting such an opinion? Deeming what you have publicly taught them to be true,—namely, that it is "no crime to believe with Mr Belsham," who declares that the *Scriptures are not the word of God*,—feeling the inconsistency (as I am certain some of them will and do feel it) of violating the rules of interpretation, in order to make the apostles speak as, in their apprehension, they ought to speak, and unable to reconcile what the apostles say with their own views, — will it not be natural to throw off the restraints which the old ideas of the inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures impose upon them, and receive them simply on the ground on which they place any other writings of a moral and religious nature?

I make no pretensions to uncommon foresight, in regard to this subject. I certainly do not say these things with invidious designs, and for the sake of kindling the fire of contention. Very far from it. On the contrary, I fear that the parties now contending here, will not cease to contend, until this ground be openly taken. For myself, I regard it as more desirable, in many points of view, that the authority of the Scripture should at once be cast off, and its claims to divine inspiration rejected, than that such rules of exegesis should be introduced, as to make the Scriptures speak, against their obvious meaning, whatever any party may desire. Avowed unbelief in the divine authority of the Scriptures can never continue long, as I would fain believe, in the present day of light and examination. Such a state of things may pass away with the generation who act in it: But it is a more difficult matter to purge away the stain which Christianity may contract by violated laws of interpretation. Those who do thus violate these laws, may obtain and hold, for a long time, great influence over the mass of people who are not accustomed to examine, in a critical manner, the nicer points of theology. If opponents to this method of interpretation lift up the voice of warning, they may not be heard. They are liable to the imputation of bigotry, or illiberality, or ignorance. But, when men professedly cast off their respect to the authority of the Scriptures, the case becomes different, and the great body of plain and sober people will revolt.

In making these observations on the nature and probable consequences of that exegesis which explains away the Deity of Christ, I cannot think that I am building castles in the air to amuse my own imagination. For ten years past, I have been called every week to duties which necessitated me to be conversant with the history of interpretation, as it has appeared in Germany, a country which, in half a century, has produced more works on criticism and sacred literature than the world contains besides. About fifty years since, Semler, Professor of Divinity at Halle, began to lecture and publish on the subject of interpretation, in a manner that excited the attention of the whole Geman empire. The grand principle, by which he explained away whatever he did not think proper to believe, was that which has been called *accommodation.* He maintained, that the apostles and the Saviour often admitted representations and doctrines into their instructions, which were calculated merely for the purpose of persuading the Jews, being *accommodated* to their prejudices; but which were not intended to be a real directory of sentiment. In this way, whatever was inconsistent with his own views, he called *accommodation*, and thus at once expunged it from the list of Christian doctrines.

Semler's original genius and great learning soon gave currency to his views in Germany, where a system of theology and exegesis had prevailed, which, in not a few respects, needed reformation. Since his time a host of writers (many of them with exalted talents and most extensive erudition) have arisen, who have examined, explained, modified, and defended the doctrine of *accommodation.* The more recent method of exegesis, however, in Germany, has been to solve all the miraculous facts related in the Bible, by considerations which are affirmed to be drawn from the idiom and ignorance of antiquity in general, and in particular of the sacred writers themselves. Thus, with Eichhorn, the account of the creation and fall of man is merely a poetical and philosophical speculation, of some ingenious person, on the origin of the world and of evil, (Urgeschichte, passsim.) So, in regard to the offering up of Isaac by Abraham, he says, "The Godhead could not have required of Abraham so horrible a crime; and there can be no justification, palliation, or excuse, for this pretended command of the Divinity." He then explains it. "Abraham *dreamed* that he must offer up Isaac; and, according to the superstition of the times, regarded it as a divine admonition. He prepared to execute the mandate which his dream had conveyed to him. A lucky accident (probably the rustling of a ram who was entangled in the bushes) hindered it; and this, according to ancient idiom, was also the voice of the Divinity," (Bibliothek. Band. i. s. 45, &c.)

The same writer represents the history of the Mosaic legislation, at Mount Sinai, in a curious manner. Moses ascended to the top of Sinai and built a fire there—(how he found wood on this barren rock, or raised it to the top, Eichhorn does not tell us) — a fire consecrated to the worship of God, before which he prayed. Here an unexpected and tremendous thunder-storm occurred. He seized the occasion to proclaim the laws which he had composed in his retirement as the statutes of Jehovah,—leading the people to believe that Jehovah had conversed with him. Not that he was a deceiver, but he really believed that the occurrence of such a thunder-storm was a sufficient proof of the fact that Jehovah had spoken to him, or sanctioned the work in which he had been engaged, (Bibliothek. Band. i. Theil. l. s. 76, &c.) The prophecies of the Old Testament are, according to him, patriotic wishes, expressed with all the fire and elegance of poetry, for the future prosperity and a future deliverer of the Jewish nation. (Propheten, Bibliothek. Einleit. passim.)

In like manner, C. F. Ammon, Professor of Theology at Erlangen, tells us, in respect to the miracle of Christ's walking on the water, that "to walk on the sea, is not to stand on the waves as on the solid ground, as Jerome *dreams*, but to walk through the waves so far as the shoals reached, and then to swim." (Pref. to edit. of Ernesti Inst. Interpret. p. 12.) So in regard to the miracle of the loaves and fishes, (Mat. xiv, 15,) he says, that Jesus probably distributed some loaves and fishes which he had to those who were around him, and thus excited, by his example, others among the multitude, who had provisions, to distribute them in like manner, (p. 16.)

Thiess, in his commentary on the Acts, explains the miraculous effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost (Acts, ii.) in the following manner. "It is not uncommon," says he, "in those countries, for a violent gust of wind to strike on a particular spot or house. Such a gust is commonly accompanied by the electric fluid, and the sparks of this are scattered all around. These float about the chamber, become apparent, and light upon the disciples. They kindle into enthusiasm at this; and believe the promise of their Master is now to be performed. This enthusiasm spectators assemble to witness; and, instead of preaching as before in Hebrew, each one uses his own native tongue to proclaim his feelings."

I have not followed the words through the whole, but have given the substance of Thiess's views in my two last sentences. Such was the outpouring of the Spirit, and such the gift of tongues.

The same Thiess (Comm. on chap. iii.) represents the miraculous cure by Peter, of the man who was lame from his birth, in a very singular way. "This man," says he, "was lame only according to report. He never walked any; so the people believed he could not walk —— Peter and John, being more sagacious, however, *threatened* him. 'In the name of the Messiah,' said they, 'stand up.' The word *Messiah* had a magical power. He stood up. Now, one saw that he could walk. To prevent the compassion of men from being turned into rage (at his deceit,) he chose the most sagacious party, and connected himself with the Apostles."

The case of Ananias falling down dead, is thus represented by the same writer. "Ananias fell down terrified; but probably he was carried out and buried, while still alive."

Heinrichs, however, who produces this comment of Thiess, relates another mode of explaining the occurrence in question,—namely, that *Peter stabbed Ananias*; "which," says Heinrichs, "does not at all disagree with the vehement and easily exasperated temper of Peter." (Nov. Test. Koppianum, Vol. iii. Partic. ii. pp. 355—357, &c.)

Numerous systems of Hermeneutica, that is, the Art of Interpretation, have been written and published in Germany, on this plan. Meyer, in a very laboured system of Hermeneutica of the Old Testament, in two large octavos, has a body of rules by which every thing miraculous is to be explained away. He concedes that there is the same objection to admitting any one miracle, as to admitting all. He therefore rejects the whole. So Bauer, in his Hermeneutica; and a multitude of others.

In the course of the discussions which these principles have excited in Germany, the question about Christ's divinity has been entirely forgotten. When the contest first began, this point, among others, was warmly contested. But the fundamental questions, whether the Scriptures are divinely inspired, and whether the doctrine of *accommodation* can be used in all its latitude, in interpreting them, soon take the place of this. *Accommodation* has been sifted, attacked, defended, explained, moderated, modified, itself *accommodated;* so that at last it is nearly driven from the ground, and the plain and simple rules of grammatical interpretation are triumphant among the best part of the German critics.

In the mean time, they have not returned to the principles of their Lutheran Symbol. Very far from it. While many of them allow that John, and Peter, and Paul, did believe and teach the doctrine of Christ's divinity and of the atonement, they hold themselves under no obligation to receive them. De Wette, who has recently published a System of Theology, and is professor of the same at the University of Berlin, maintains that the Pentateuch was composed about the time of the Captivity; that the Jewish ritual was of gradual formation, accessions being made to it by superstition; and that the Book of Chronicles (which is filled with scraps and inconsistencies) was foisted into the canon by some of the priesthood, who wished to exalt their own order. His *Beiträge*, which contained these sentiments, was published before the death of Griesbach, and came out recommended by him; who says, "If you object to the young literary adventurer (De Wette,) that he has endeavoured to bring Judaism into disrepute, my answer is, This no more than Paul himself has laboured to do." (Pref. to *Beiträge.*)

In his book on the atonement of Christ, *(De morte Christi expiatoriâ,)* he represents Christ as disappointed that the Jews would not hearken to him as a moral teacher simply; which was the first character he assumed. Christ then assumed the character of a prophet, and asserted his divine mission, in order that the Jews might be induced to listen to him. Finding that they would not do this, and that they were dertermined to destroy him, in order not to lose the whole object of his mission, and to convert necessity into an occasion of giving himself credit, he gave out that his death itself would be *expiatory.*

Yet De Wette holds a most exalted rank in Germany. I doubt whether Germany can boast of an Oriental scholar, or a literary man, who has more admirers than De Wette.

What shall we say now of De Wette? That he is not a Christian? He would look with astonishment on any man who would think of such an accusation, and tax him with a great degree of illiberality and superstition.

You are doubtless inclined, before this time, to say, "What is all this to us? We do not avow or defend such opinions." True, I answer, at present you do not. A short time since, *they* did not: But as soon as their numbers increased, so that they began to be fearless of consequences, and their antagonists urged the laws of exegesis upon them, they abandoned the ground of defending the divine authenticity of the Bible at once. A few years since, the state of theological questions in Germany, in many respects, was similar to what it now is here. At present, the leading German critics (rejecting *accommodation*, and casting off all ideas of the divine origin of the Scriptures,) are disputing with great zeal the questions, Whether a miracle be possible? Whether God and nature are one and the same thing? (Schelling, a *divine*, is at the head of a great party which maintains that they are the same.) And whether the Jews ever expected any Messiah? Some time ago, many of their critics maintaned that no Messiah was predicted in the Old Testament; but now, they question even whether the Jews had any expectation of one. It would seem now, that they have come nearly to the end of questions on *theology:* at least, I cannot well devise what is to come next.

It does seem to me, that it needs only a thorough acquaintance with German reasoners and critics (a thing which is fast coming in,) to induce young men to go with them, who set out with the maxim, that to "believe with Mr Belsham is no crime." No man can read these writers without finding a great deal of excellent matter in them, well arranged, and of real utility. I venture to add, that no man can study them thoroughly, and afterwards take up Priestley, Belsham, Carpenter, Yates, Lindsay, or other recent English Unitarian writers, as *critics*, with any pleasure. I ought, perhaps, to except Cappe, who appears to have studied diligently his Bible. He was evidently a lover of Biblical study. But the incomparably greater acquisitions of the German critics in every department of study, spread a charm over their writings, for the lover of discussion and literature, that is not often found in productions of this nature. I must add, that, much as I differ in sentiment from them, *and fundamentally subversive of Christianity* as I believe their views to be, I am under great obligations to them for the instructions they have given me; and specially for affording me so much satisfaction, that we need nothing more than the simple rules of exegesis, and a candid believing heart, to see in the Scriptures, with overpowering evidence, all the substantial and important doctrines which have commonly been denominated *orthodox.*

Such has been the impression on me from reading German writers: And, with such impressions, I can never regret the time that I have spent in studying them. Abler advocates than they for the fashionable philosophy of the day, which is endeavouring to explain away the peculiar doctrines of the Scriptures, I do not expect to find. Able, however, as they are, my mind returns from the study of them with an impression more deep, radical, and satisfactory, than ever before, that the doctrines commonly denominated *evangelical* or *orthodox*, are the doctrines of the Scriptures, and are the truth of God. My views as to the exegesis of particular texts, in some cases, have been changed by the study of philology and interpretation: I should not rely for the proof of doctrines now, on some texts which I once thought contained such proof: But my impressions of the real truth and importance of evangelical doctrines, I can truly say, are greatly strengthened. Before you pronounce sentence upon the German expositors and critics, to whom I have referred above, I trust you will give them a hearing. I should rejoice to find that you are engaged in the study of them: For a mind capable of reasoning and thinking as yours, must necessarily, as it seems to me, come to the same conclusions with Eichhorn, and Paulus, and Henke, and Eckermann, and Herder, and other distinguished men of the new German school; or embrace with us the sentiments which are commonly denominated orthodox. I cannot refrain from adding, that I do most earnestly hope and pray for the latter.

You may be ready, perhaps, to express your surprise, that I should commend the study of such writers as those whom I have quoted. I am well aware, indeed, that the serious mind revolts at the glaring impiety of such comments as those which I have produced: But, after all, if a man were to judge of, and condemn, these very writers by a few selections of this nature, it would be hasty. On points which are not concerned with the special doctrines of Christianity—in illustrating critical and literary history, philology, natural history, and grammatical exegesis—in a word, every thing literary or scientific that pertains to the Bible—who can enter into competition with recent German writers? But it should be understood, that there are writers on these subjects in Germany, who are what is denominated *orthodox*, as well as those of a different character, such as I have just mentioned. The lover of acute, thoroughgoing, radical discussion, will lose much, if he does not cultivate an acquaintance with both these classes of writers.

I know, indeed, that you are an advocate for unlimited research. For myself, I have long practised upon this principle; and I cannot but think the cautious fears of many of those with whom I agree in sentiment, in respect to the limits of study, though honourable to the spirit of piety which they cherish, and indicative of real interest and concern for the prosperity of the Church, are not well founded. The fundamental principle of Protestantism is, that the *Bible is the only rule of faith and practice.* To know what the Bible teaches, then, is the great object of all religious knowledge. To understand this, (as to acquire every thing else,) study and diligence are necessary. Men are not inspired now, as the apostles and primitive Christians were, to understand all truth. Men are imperfect, and have imperfect knowledge. No one sect, party, or body of men, can claim absolute perfection of knowledge or virtue. And as a great many points of inquiry (interesting and important ones too) may be managed by men of sobriety, in the use of only their natural intellect, and their resources of learning, the man who loves the Book of God, and desires the most extensive acquaintance with it which he can possibly make, will not neglect their works, nor any other source of knowledge within his power. It was a noble maxim of a heathen, "*Fas est et ab hoste doceri,— We may receive instruction even from an enemy.*" Christians too often forget this; and permit antipathy to particular sentiments to exclude them from all the profit which might be derived from a more enlarged acquaintance with the writings of opponents. Believing, as I do, that many who are arrayed against the sentiments that I espouse, are not destitute of sense or of learning, and are not to be despised, I am inclined always to see how they vindicate their cause. If I am not convinced by *their* arguments, I am rendered better satisfied with *my own*, and more able to defend them by such an investigation. But if I could not practise upon the noble maxim, "*We may receive instruction even from an enemy,*" I would at least apply another one to vindicate the study of the German writers, and justify myself for even recommending it in proper cases. I would say, (as was said in a different connection and for a different object,) "*Egyptii sunt spoliemus,— They are Egyptians, let us take their spoils.*" Shall I not accept the good which they proffer me: and proffer me in a more scientific manner, and well digested, lucid established form, than I can elsewhere find? Without hesitation, I answer, Yes.

I cannot help viewing the subject in another light. Every student in theology, every Christian minister, ought to be established in the truth, and able to "*convince gainsayers.*" How can he do this, *if he does not know what these gainsayers allege?* Is he to engage in war against the foes of truth, without knowing the weapons by which his enemies are to assail him? It is a mistaken system of education, indeed, which teaches him thus, which thrusts out a young man upon the Church, unacquainted with the nature of its enemies' assaults, and liable, of course, to become the victim of the first powerful attack that is made upon him. Without any doubt, private Christians should have little or nothing to do with all this ground of dispute; but it is a shame for a minister of the Gospel, who has the opportunity, not to seize every advantage in his power, to render himself as able as possible to defend the cause which he has espoused.

I may venture to add a better authority still, to confirm these reasonings. An inspired apostle has directed Christians to "*prove all things;*" but to "*hold fast that which is good.*" How does he comply with the spirit of this direction, who never examines any views that differ from his own; but settles down with the full conviction that he is right, and that all who differ from him are wrong? As no man now is inspired, and no man, therefore, is free from some error, does it not become those who are to be "set for the defence of the truth," to examine, as far as it may be in their power, the dissentient views of others who have called themselves Christians, and who lay claim to an understanding of the Word of God? Such an examination will enlarge their views, and render them more able to oppose error and defend truth.

Such are my reasons for pursuing the study of German writers, and commending the study of them. Truth has nothing to fear from examination. If the sentiments that I espouse will not stand the test of investigation, then I will abandon them. I never shall willingly embrace any sentiments, except on such a condition. But in respect to the study of the more *liberal* (so called) German writers, I fear no injury from it in the end, to the sentiments denominated *evangelical.* Exegesis has come, by discussion among them, to a solid and permanent science. That the scriptural writers taught substantially, what we believe to be *orthodoxy*, is now conceded by some of their most able expositors.

There is another point of view in which the subject may be regarded. The person who reads their works, will see what the spirit of doubt and unbelief can do, in respect to the Book of God, and where it will carry the men who entertain it. It is indeed a most affecting and awful lesson. But is there no reason to fear that we are to learn it by sad experience? Does not the progress of the sentiments which you defend illustrate the nature of this subject? A short time since, almost all the Unitarians of New England were simple Arians. Now, if I am correctly informed, there are scarcely any of the younger preachers of Unitarian sentiments who are not simple *Humanitarians.* Such was the case in Germany. The divinity of Christ was early assailed; inspiration was next doubted and impugned. Is not this already begun here? Natural religion comes next in order; and the question between the parties here may soon be in substance whether *natural* or *revealed* religion is our guide and our hope.

For myself, I must say, it is my conviction, that the sooner matters come to this issue, the better. Not that natural religion is better in itself than Unitarianism. No; I believe Christianity, under any form, is better than Deism. But the contest which is now carried on here, will be more speedily terminated by such an issue. The parties will then understand each other; and the public will understand the subject of dispute I cannot think that they do at present. It is but very recently that explicit declarations have been made in print by you and your friends. And though with such views as I possess, I cannot help feeling the most sincere regret that such sentiments should be propagated, yet I can never do otherwise than applaud that ingenuousness, which openly avows sentiments that are more privately inculcated. I shall be very ready to confess my apprehensions are quite erroneous, if the lapse of a few years more does not produce, in many cases, the undisguised avowal of the German divinity in all its latitude. I anticipate this, because I believe that the laws of exegesis, when thoroughly understood, and applied without party bias, will necessarily lead men to believe that the apostles inculcated, for substance, those doctrines which are now called *orthodox.* And as there will probably be not a few who will reject these doctrines, my apprehension is, that to take the German ground, will, ere long, be deemed both ingenuous and expedient.

Believing, however, as I now do, while my convictions remain, I must act agreeably to them. I hope I shall never be guilty of exercising an exclusive or persecuting spirit. But, while my present views last, I cannot look with indifference on the great contest which is pending in this part of our country. I must regard the opinions, which you have avowed in your sermon, to be fundamentally subversive of what appear to me to be the peculiarities of the Christian system. If the doctrines of Christ's divinity and humanity be not true, nor that of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, and pardon by it—if human nature be not of itself entirely destitute of principles of holiness, that may fit men for heaven, and does not need special regenerating and sanctifying grace,—then I know not what there is in the Christian system, that very much concerns our duty or our interest, which is not taught by the principles of natural religion, nor what there is for which it is our duty to contend. The great question at present between you and me is, What does the Bible teach on the subjects proposed? For our answer to this question, you and I stand accountable to the Judge of quick and dead; and, as ministers of his Gospel, and interpreters of his Word, we are placed under an awful responsibility. If either of us violate the reason which God has given us in our inquiries—are led by partial views, by passion, by prejudice, by thirst for popularity with our friends, or a fear of reproach from those whom we are obliged to consider as opponents,—Christ will require from us an account of our conduct. When I think on this, and look back and ask myself whether I have conducted this whole dispute with a view to my account, and in the fear of God, I cannot but feel solicitude lest, through the deceitfulness of the human heart, something may have escaped me which may prove prejudicial, in some way or other, to the promotion of real truth. If you see this, my dear Sir, tell me where and what it is. We have no real interest but to know, believe, and obey the truth. And, supposing truth to be what it now appears to me to be, I cannot believe otherwise than that you are endeavouring to inculcate principles radically subversive of the Gospel of Christ. Will you do me the justice to believe that I may have honestly formed such an opinion, without taking my faith from creeds, or grounding it on tradition; and without the spirit that would establish an inquisition, or lord it over the consciences of men, or treat you with disrespect?

In a word, with those who have the convictions that I possess of the nature and importance of the Gospel system, it can never admit of a question, whether they are to make all the opposition in their power (provided it be done in the spirit of Christian candour and benevolence,) to the prevalence of sentiments like yours. I cannot but view the question between us as amounting to this, whether we shall retain Christianity, or reject all but the name? If I am wrong, may the Lord forgive me, and grant me better views. If you are wrong, my heart's desire and prayer to God is, that the same blessing may be bestowed on you.

Allowing that I and those with whom I act are sincere in our belief, you yourself would say, that we should be justly chargeable with the greatest inconsistency, did we not feel strong desires to resist the innovations that are attempted in many important points of our theology. Permit me to add, that real charity may sometimes attribute strong feelings and a deep interest on this subject, to ardent benevolence towards those who differ from us, and whom we think to be in a dangerous condition, rather than to party zeal, blind credulity and ignorance, or an exterminating and injurious spirit.

And now, to bring these already protracted Letters to a close, you will permit me respectfully and seriously to solicit that you would look back and review the sermon which has occasioned these remarks. Have you represented the sentiments of the great body of Christians in this country correctly? Have you produced the real arguments on which they rely? Have you treated them with respect, with gentleness, with tenderness? Has your simple aim been to reason with them, to convince them, and not to hold them up in such an attitude as to excite disgust? I do not ask these questions for the sake of reproach, or to wound your feelings; but I cannot help thinking it a duty incumbent on me to ask them. Look now, with a Christian eye, on the unhappy and distracted state of the Churches in this land, the glory of all lands! When will our contentions cease? When shall we bring a united offering to our common Lord, if men who stand in eminent and responsible stations treat those whom they profess to own as *Christian brethren*, with severity, or in such a manner as to wound their feelings?

My dear Sir, I do think these are things which, when we enter our closets to lift up our souls to God, we are all bound by sacred obligations to consider. I do not bring these as charges against you; but I speak of the impressions which your discourse has excited in the bosoms of those who espouse the sentiments which you condemn. If their impressions are without reason, the wrong may indeed fall upon them. But, in reviewing the manner in which you have treated some subjects in your sermon, is there not more reason for those impressions than Christian meekness and benevolence can approve? When the hours of excitement and the stimulus of party feeling are gone by, you and I shall stand at the bar of that Saviour who searches the hearts and tries the reins of men. There we shall be obliged to account for the manner in which we have conducted this whole dispute.

O my dear Sir! this is no trifling matter. We are immortal beings; and our eternal destiny is in the hands of that Redeemer about whose dignity and glory we are contending.

When I think on this, I cannot but apprehend that the question between us is of deep and radical interest, as it respects our eternal salvation. If the God whom I am bound to adore has not only revealed himself in the book of nature, but has clearly disclosed his glory in the Gospel of Christ, and I mistake, after all, a revelation so clear, or, induced by party feeling or erroneous philosophy, reject the testimony which he has given, the mistake must be tremendous in its consequences, the rejection will justly incur the divine displeasure. With all this subject, however, fully before me, I do not hesitate, I cannot doubt respecting it. When I behold the glory of the Saviour, as revealed in the Gospel, I am constrained to cry out with the believing apostle, "My Lord and my God!" And when my departing spirit shall quit these mortal scenes, and wing its way to the world unknown, with my latest breath I desire to pray, as the expiring martyr did, "LORD JESUS, RECEIVE MY SPIRIT!"

APPENDIX.

TWO PASSAGES, ADDED BY PROFESSOR STUART IN A LATE EDITION OF HIS LETTERS, ARE INTRODUCED IN THIS FORM INSTEAD OF BEING INSERTED IN THE BODY OF THE WORK.

BY comparing the paragraph in page 10, with the same paragraph in the former editions of this work, the reader will see that some of it is modified, to avoid the ambiguity which seemed to be chargeable upon the former editions; or changed, to correct that which, if literally taken, would be erroneous. I had said that "the word *person* was introduced into the creeds of ancient times, merely as a term which would express the disagreement of Christians in general with the reputed errors of Sabellius, and others of similar sentiments." And although I certainly did *not* mean to say that such a use of it was *universal*, and *without exception*, as I well knew the phrase had been variously and loosely used by some of the fathers, yet I prefer to remove the ambiguity of the phrase by a limitation which, so far as I have been able to examine, seems more accurately to correspond with the state of the case. My belief is, that the leading and most influential fathers and councils of antiquity did use *person* as I have now stated.

As the text stood in former editions of this work, it would appear as if I meant to say that the Nicene Fathers, in their Symbol, had used the word *person* in the sense alleged. This, however, I did not mean to say, although it will appear on examination, perhaps, that I might have safely said it. I admit that my expression is of a dubious nature, or even that it will convey the sense which the Reviewer has given to it. I meant to say, that the fathers who belonged to the Nicene Council, the divines of that age, in their writings, used the word *person* to designate a distinction in the Godhead in opposition to the opinions of Sabellius, and others of like sentiments with him.

The Reviewer, however, in the " Christian Disciple," in admonishing me of an error in respect to this, has perhaps himself fallen into one. He says that the Nicene Creed contains neither the word ὑποστασις, nor προσωπον; whereas, if he had read the Creed four or five lines beyond what I have quoted, he would have found it anathematizing those " who affirm that the Son is of a different *hypostasis* (ὑποστασεως) from the Father." The sense of ὑποστασις here, however, some may incline to think is not that of *person*, but of *substance* simply. But Basil, and in like manner Bishop Bull, have contended, perhaps triumphantly, for the meaning of *person*. Bull, Opp. p. 114, &c.

The only question of any importance at issue on the present topic is, Did the ancient fathers use the word *person*, in respect to the Godhead, to designate beings so distinct as to have only a *specific unity*, as the Reviewer, after Whitby and others, had asserted? or did they use it to designate a distinction in the Godhead, in opposition to sentiments like those of Sabellius, and with the acknowledgment of the *numerical unity* of the Godhead? The question, of course, is, Did the leading and most influential divines and councils maintain the one or the other of these views? If the former, then my allegation is incorrect; if the latter, then the substance of what I have hitherto said upon this subject has not been disproved.

It were easy to occupy a volume with the discussion of this subject; but my limits necessitate me to be very brief. I begin with an inquiry into the meaning of ὑποστασις.

The Antenicene Fathers used this word, perhaps, commonly in the sense of ὀυσια, *substance* or *essence*. But some used it to signify *person*, or *distinction* in the Godhead. In consequence of the word being differently used by different writers, and in reference to divers heresies, great disputes arose in the Church about it. At first, the orthodox Fathers in general strongly objected to ὑποστασις as applied to designate a distinction in the Godhead, because they averred that it meant *substance* or *essence;* and to assert that there were three substances in the Godhead, they said, was antiscriptural. Thus Dionysius Romanus (about A. D. 250) reprobates those " who separate the Divinity into three different *hypostases*." (Advers. Saball. as cited in Athanas. Decret. Synod. Nic. p. 220.) And again, " They preach as it were three Gods, dividing the sacred Unity into three hypostases, diverse and altogether separate from each other."

So Athanasius (Epist. ad Antioch.) says, " We speak of one hypostasis, — deeming hypostasis and ὀυσια, *substance*, the *same*."

The opposition to hypostasis, in such a sense, was general in the Latin Churches, because they translated both ὑποστασις and ὀυσια, *substantia, substance;* and they refused to say that there were *three substances* in the Godhead.

How far Origen, and others of his school, were implicated in the condemnation passed by them upon such a use of hypostasis, does not certainly appear. Origen maintains three hypostases; but that he asserts them in such a sense as to exclude *numerical unity* of essence and attributes in the Godhead, I have not seen satisfactorily evinced.

After the Sabellian opinions were propagated in the Church, many of the Greek Fathers maintained, in opposition to them, that there were three hypostases in the Godhead. Contentions soon arose about this phraseology, because it was deemed by some to imply too much. These contentions were in some measure composed, however, by the Synod of Alexandria, (A. D. 362,) at which Athanasius was present, who decided that " any one was at liberty to aver that there was but one hypostasis in the Godhead, provided the threefold distinction therein was preserved, or to maintain three hypostases, provided that only *one substance* was meant." (Hardouin, tom. i. 734.)

About this time, in order to avoid the ambiguity of hypostasis, the Greeks began to substitute προσωπον, *person*, in imitation of the Latin *persona*, which was used in the Western Churches. The classical use of both the Greek and Latin word, is indeed quite different from the ecclesiastical one. But προσωπον and *persona* evidently assumed a technical use in the Churches. After the Synod of Alexandria, the Greek Church used both ὑποστασις and προσωπον in the same sense — as did the Latins *persona, hypostasis* — in respect to the subject in question.

It remains now, after having given this sketch of the history of ὑποστασις and προσωπον in the Greek Church, and *persona* and *hypostasis* in the Latin, to shew that a distinction in the Godhead was designated by them, which was deemed consistent with numerical unity of substance and attributes, and was not intended to designate *person* in such a sense as admitted only *specific unity*.

It will of course be seen that this question does not regard the use of ὑποστασις in the classic sense of *substance* or *essence*, — a sense which some of the Fathers gave to it, when they affirmed that there could be but one hypostasis in the Godhead; but the use of hypostasis to designate *person* or *distinction* in the Godhead. In a word, when the Greek Fathers use hypostasis or πϱοσωπον for a distinction in the Godhead, or the Latins *persona* or *hypostasis* in the same way, do they use them so that we must fairly understand them as admitting a *numerical unity* of essence or attributes, or only a *specific unity* of the Godhead?

That a uniformity among the Fathers, in the use of these terms, existed without exception, and that no inconsistency or inaccuracy in respect to the use of them can be found, is more than any one would undertake to prove, who knows how loosely many of the Fathers have written, and how little the study of accuracy, in the use of language, prevailed among them. Making only proper allowances for this (allowances which must be made for modern as well as ancient times) I think it can be shewn that the view which I have given, in the paragraph of my Letters that occasioned this discussion, is substantially correct.

Tertullian, the earliest father who presents us with the terms *person* and *Trinity* (Lib. advers. Prax. c. 2,) in the passage before quoted in these Letters more at length (see page 12,) seems plainly to use the word *person* in the sense which I have attached to it. His antagonist Praxeas denied that there was any distinction in the Godhead, or any except a *verbal* one. "This perversity (that is, of Praxeas) thinks itself," says Tertullian, "to be in possession of pure truth, while it supposes that we are to believe in one God, not otherwise than if we make the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost the self-same,—as if all were not one, while all are of one,—namely, *by a unity of substance*."

Farther on he says, "I call him (the *Logos*) a *person*, and pay him reverence." And again, "We are baptized into the *persons* (of the Godhead) severally, by the use of their several names."

The key to this language is plainly to be found in the opinions of Praxeas, which denied any distinction in the Godhead. Tertullian means to assert it; to do which, he uses the word *person* and *persons*, while he expressly acknowledges a *unity* of substance. That this unity is *numerical* and not *specific*, seems to me to be plainly indicated by the manner in which he expresses himself,—which is equivalent to saying, "About the *unity* of the Godhead as to *substance*, we do not dispute with Praxeas — we only maintain that there is a distinction, which we call *person*, not inconsistent with such a unity."

In regard to Origen, it has generally been thought that he maintained nothing more than a *specific* unity in the Godhead, while it is beyond a doubt that he asserts the existence of three hypostases. (See Compar. in Johan. p. 24.) To ascertain in every case the exact meaning of words, in a writer who uses them so carelessly (sometimes, to appearance, inconsistently) as Origen does, would be a task difficult indeed to be performed. That he believed in the doctrine of the eternal generation and divinity of the Son, can scarcely be doubted, when the various assertions which he has made on this subject are compared together, (See Bull. Opp. pp. 105, &c.) That the three hypostases, which he predicates of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, do not imply *persons* in the sense of the word which is now common, may be inferred probably from what he says of the indivisibility of the divine nature. "God," he says "is altogether incorruptible, and simple, and composite, *not divisible*," (Lib. iv. cont. Cels. p. 169.) Again, "The only begotten, God our Saviour, the only begotten of the Father, is Son by nature, not by adoption. He is born of the mind of the Father, as the will of the mind. For the *divine nature is not divisible*, that is, of the unbegotten Father, *that we should think the Son is begotten by any division or diminution of his substance*," (Lib. 2, in Johan. as cited by Pamphilus in Apolog.)

While Origen, therefore, maintains the doctrine of three hypostases, or persons, he does it in such a sense as consists with the indivisibility,—that is, the numerical unity of the Godhead. But, to explain or to justify all his speculations about the generation of the Son, is what I shall by no means attempt.

Cyprian, contemporary with Origen, has little in his writings which concerns the present question. In his letter to Jubianus, however, after mentioning the Father, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, he says, "These three are one;" and he afterwards speaks of Christ's "commanding to baptize into the full and one (adunata) Trinity."

Lactantius, (about A. D. 300,) speaking of the Father and Son, says, "To each belongs one mind, one spirit, one *substance*," (Lib. 4. c. 49.)

The testimonies of the Antenicene Fathers, to the *eternity* of the Son, may be seen in the works of Bishop Bull, above referred to; but as they have not a determinate bearing upon the point in question, I pass them over.

Omitting the minor Fathers, let us come to the Nicene Creed, the collected sense of the great body of the Church at the beginning of the fourth century. This declares the Son to be ὁμοουσιος, *consubstantial*, with the Father. Does this exclude or imply *numerical unity* of substance?

The meaning of the word ὁμοουσιος must be here investigated. Originally it was applied to things which belong to the same species or have the same nature. Thus Aristotle calls the stars ὁμοουσια, *consubstantial;* and Chrysostom (Hom. 16, in Gen.) says that Eve was *consubstantial*, ὁμοουσιος, with Adam. So the

Pseudo-Justin, in opposing some of Aristotle's doctrines, says, "In respect to a rational nature, angels and demons are *consubstantial*."

This word, however, was so seldom used by ecclesiastical writers, before the Council of Nice, in relation to the distinction in the Godhead, that the introduction of it has (though erroneously) been ascribed to that Council. But Origen (A. D. 230, Dial. cont. Marcion,) calls the *Logos consubstantial;* and Dionysius of Alexandria (A. D. 250) repeatedly uses the same appellation in respect to Christ, (Suicer in ὁμοουσιος.)

Eusebius of Cesarea, one of the Nicene Fathers, in addressing his Church about the Symbol of the Council of Nice, defends the use of the word *consubstantial* in their Creed, by saying that "he knew of some *ancient*, learned, and renowned doctors in the Churches who used it," (Athanas. Epist. ad Afr. T. I. p. 987.)

It would seem, that before the Council of Nice, the word ὁμοουσιος had already come (as it certainly afterwards did,) to signify, as many used it, a *numerical unity of substance.* In such a sense, it compares with ὁμοπατριος, *of the same Father;* ὁμογενος, *of the same nation;* ὁμεζυγος, *under the same yoke.* Those who held to the doctrines of Sabellius, however, and Paul of Samosata, seem to have abused the word, in order to perplex their opponents. It was on this ground that the Council of Antioch (A. D. 263) rejected the application of it to the Son, — not because they disbelieved, as the Reviewer would seem to intimate, the divine nature of Christ. The epistle, which six leading Bishops of that Council addressed to Paul of Samosata, before his excommunication, says, "That the Son —— is God, not by foreknowledge, but in substance and hypostases —— we profess and preach," (Biblioth. max. Pat. Tom. iii. p. 349.) Athanasius, stating the reason why this Council rejected the word ὁμοουσιος, says, that "Paul of Samosata affirmed, that if Christ were *consubstantial* with the Father, then it necessarily followed that there were three substances — one prior, and two posterior — derived from it. To avoid this sophism," adds Athanasius, "those Fathers very properly said that Christ was not *consubstantial*, — that is, that the Father did not hold such a relation to the Son as Paul supposed, (Athanas. Opp. T. I. p. 919.) A similar account of the rejection of *consubstantial* by this Council is given by Basil. (Opp. T. iii. Epist. ccc.)

After all, however, it would seem that the ancient and modern writers, in their discussion of this subject, have mistaken the meaning of the Council of Antioch; and that they merely denied that Christ κατα σαρκα, *as to his human nature*, was consubstantial with the Father, (see Doed. Inst. vol. i. § 115. c., and J. W. Feverlein, de Concil. Antioc. there cited.)

Neither Athanasius nor Basil, two of the most zealous and able defenders of the doctrine of the Trinity among all the ancient Fathers, intimate, so far as I have been able to learn, the least suspicion that the Council of Antioch were Unitarians. It is very clear, from the passage above cited, that this Council believed in the divinity of Christ: And since these Fathers lived so near the time when the Council in question was held, and were so jealous as well as earnest on the subject of Christ's divinity, it scarcely admits of a doubt, that the conclusion of the Reviewer in regard to the sentiments of this Council, is erroneous.

Thus much for ὁμοουσιος, before the Council of Nice. In the Symbol which they drew up, the word was inserted after much discussion and consideration. Many members of the Council were afraid that the same use might be made of it which Paul of Samosata had made. It was not until "after many questions and answers, and accurate investigation of the meaning of the term," says Eusebius, in writing an account of the Nicene Creed to his Church, "that it was admitted. Those who defended it," he goes on to say, "averred that it signified that the Son was of the substance of the Father, but *not a part* (or division) of the Father. To this sense," continues he, "it seemed proper we should assent," (Soc. Ecc. Hist. L. I. c. 8.)

In the same Epistle, Eusebius says, that Constantine the Emperor, who was President of the Nicene Council, replied to some of the Bishops, who made inquiry respecting the meaning of ὁμοουσιος, that "by it he did not mean that the Son was of the Father by any corporeal affections, nor by any division or separation (ἀποτομη;) for it was impossible that an incorporeal, intellectual, immaterial nature, should admit of corporeal affections (that is, division or separation;) but the thing was to be understood of a divine and incomprehensible manner," that is, manner of relation between the Father and Son.

It seems to me quite plain, that the explanations of Eusebius and Constantine serve to shew what they did *not* mean by ὁμοουσιος, — namely, that they did not mean to impugn the *numerical unity* of the divine substance, as they object to all idea of *separation* or *division.* *Specific unity*, however, not only admits, but demands a separation which destroys *numerical unity*.

The presumption, then, from these explanations, against the doctrine of mere specific unity being taught in the Nicene Creed, is pretty strong. It is very greatly increased, however, by the explanations which this Creed received fifty-six years afterwards, by the second ecumenical, or general Council, assembled at Constantinople, by order of Theodosius the Great, in order to restore peace to the Churches, which were rent by the Arian dispute, and specially to settle and establish the Nicene Symbol of faith. After meeting, and agreeing to receive and recommend the Nicene faith, with some small additions, made to oppose some new heresies which had arisen, they sent a Synodic Epistle to the Western Synod of Churches, who were to meet at Rome; in which they state, that in accordance with the Nicene Creed, and "the most ancient faith, and agreeable to baptism, they believe in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, — so, namely, that there is *one* divinity, power, and *substance* of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; who possess equal dignity and co-eternal dominion; who exist in three most perfect *hypostases*, or three perfect *persons*;—so that the pest of Sabellius shall have no place, which confounds the persons, and takes away their appropriate qualities; nor the blasphemy of the Eunomians, Arians, and opposers of the Holy Spirit prevail, which destroys the substance and nature and divinity of the uncreated, consubstantial, and co-eternal Trinity by introducing a posterior nature, of a different substance, and created." (Theodoreti. Ecc. Hist. L. v. c. 9.)

What in the Creed is expressed by *consubstantial*, they have here called "one (μιας) divinity, power and substance, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost;" which is a direct, and (as it appears to me) unequivocal assertion of *numerical unity*, and has so been understood, as far as I have learned, in all succeeding ages of the Church. It cannot admit of a doubt, I think, that they aimed to express the ὁμοουσιος of the Nicene Fathers, by the μιας ουσιας of their Epistle; and if so, then it is clear that they interpret the Nicene Creed as teaching *numerical* unity of substance, divinity, and power, that is, substance and attributes, in the Godhead.

In this ecumenical Council were one hundred and fifty orthodox Bishops assembled, besides a number who were attached to the sentiments of Macedonius. It is generally conceded that their decision gave an establishment and a uniformity to the Christian faith, about the doctrine of the Trinity, which remains, even to the present time, among the generality of Christians. This decision was so short a period after the Nicene Council, that some bishops present at Nice might be, and probably were, still living, and not improbably present at Constantinople. At any rate, the Fathers of the Council of Constantinople can hardly be supposed to be ignorant of what the Nicene Council meant to express by ὁμοουσιος.

That the great body of Catholics and Protestants have maintained the *numerical unity* of the Godhead, will not, I suppose, be called in question. As little can it be called in question, that the great body of them have supposed that the Council of Nice meant to assert it. This Dr Münscher concedes, in his very able attempt to shew that the Nicene Fathers meant to assert nothing more than a *specific unity* of the Godhead. (Untersuch über den Sinn der Nic. Glaub.) Very few of the older theologians in modern times have called it in question, that the Nicene Creed implies *numerical unity*; and these have always been contradicted. Not only so, but some of the great masters of ecclesiastical lore have very recently avouched the opinion in question. Schroeckh, that consummate master of Church history and patristical learning, (Kirchen Greschich. v. 344,) says, in reference to the meaning of ὁμοουσιος in the Nicene Creed, "*It cannot be doubted* that by this word no *specific unity* is meant, but a *numerical unity in respect to being*." So Walch, in his celebrated History of Heresies, has decided, (2 Th. s. 24;) and Stark, in his History of Arianism, (Berlin, 1786, 1 Th. s. 306, 307,) has given the same opinion. I will not say there is no appeal from men of such distinguished learning as these; but I may say, that what they pronounce in an unqualified manner to be true, in a case which they have fully examined, when confirmed by general opinion, in all ages, and by very express and (as it seems to me) satisfactory evidence in ancient times, may at least be asserted by me, without any special rashness; and may be said to be plain from Church history.

The bearing of this investigation about *numerical unity*, as implied or excluded by ὁμοουσιος, upon the question how the Fathers used the word *person*, is very evident. A numerical unity being acknowledged, *person* can be used in reference to the Godhead, by no considerate man, in the *same sense* in which it is applied to men. It designates a *distinction* in the Godhead, a *distinction*, of course, in opposition to those who maintain that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are in all respects identical, so far as they are divine. And when the Fathers use *person*, can they use it but in "opposition to Sabellians, and others of similar sentiments?" Most certainly the Arians did not deny that Father and Son were two hypostases. They maintained it in such a high sense as to exclude numerical unity of substance. When the Council of Constantinople affirm, therefore, that "God exists in three most perfect hypostases or perfect persons," they evidently mean to oppose Sabellius, as they proceed to say, "So that the pest of Sabellius shall have no place, *which confounds the persons*, and takes away their appropriate qualities; nor the blasphemy of the Eunomians, Arians, and opposers of the Holy Spirit prevail, which destroys the substance, and nature, and divinity of the uncreated, consubstantial, and coeternal Trinity, by introducing a posterior nature, of a different substance, and created." The latter clause here is as if they had said, The Arians, &c. make two substances, natures, &c. of Christ and the Father, and the Macedonians explain away the being of the Spirit; but we maintain *numerical unity* (μιαν ουσιαν) of substance or being, in opposition to these.

Such an explanation, by these Fathers, of what the Nicene Council meant to oppose, seems to me to indicate that the Reviewer is not correct when he intimates that the Nicene Fathers had not any particular reference to the errors of Sabellius. To oppose Arius was, no doubt, the *special* object of the Council. But then, in forming a creed, they naturally had reference to the disputes of the times in general. Dr Münscher admits this. "The Nicene Council," says he, "recognized (vorfand) as decided, the doctrine of the Church, that the Son of God is called God, and is entitled to divine honours. They recognized also the decision, established in opposition to the *Noetians and Sabellians*, that the Son or Logos is a proper hypostasis." (Untursuch, &c.) "Certainly," says Bishop Bull, (Opp. p. 114,) "it is *most clearly evident*, (liquidissimo constat) that the Nicene Fathers, in their creed, meant to impugn other heresies besides the Arian." He proceeds to say, what is very evident to be sure, that many things are contained in the creed which the Arians did not deny at all, and which must therefore refer to other sects.

I have proceeded as far in this examination as my present limits will allow. If I have justified the shape of the paragraph which the Reviewer has animadverted upon, given in the present edition, my special object is answered by this investigation.

Be this, however, as it may; as the great body of Trinitarians, since the Council of Constantinople, to say the least, have maintained the *numerical unity* of the Godhead, and as Mr Channing cannot be supposed to have attacked the Trinitarianism of the Fathers, but of the present day, so the substance of all that was aimed at in the paragraph of the Letters under consideration stands unimpeached. Trinitarians of modern times, maintaining the numerical unity of the Godhead, cannot, unless Mr Channing supposes them to be most unreasonably self-contradictory, maintain that *person* does apply, or can apply to the Godhead, in the latitude in which he understands it. The real question, therefore, as to the justice of his attack upon their opinions, is not affected by the sense in which the Fathers used the word *person*. The investigation of this question, however, may not be without some use. It may at least provoke a more diligent examination of the subject, than has hitherto taken place among us. Should this be the case, the interests of truth may be promoted by it.

POSTSCRIPT TO LETTER III.

After finishing the above Letter, your "Note for the second edition" came to hand. But as it seemed to me that most which it contained had already been anticipated, I did not think it of importance to change the shape of the Letter, and adapt it to your Note as well as Sermon. I was still less inclined to this, because I had endeavoured, as far as possible, to avoid giving any personal shape to the controversy; knowing how bitter and irrelevant to the original subject all controversies soon become when personalities are admitted. I have not the most distant design of saying any thing with a view to wound your personal sensibility; but I do feel, and I ought to feel, a deep interest in addressing the understanding and reason of a man who, by his weight of character, sobriety of mind, and eminent talents, has acquired so much influence in society as you have. And, in order to do this with propriety, I have endeavoured, as far as possible, to throw the whole subject into the shape of a discussion respecting principles; and to avoid that form of writing which too commonly involves personal reflection.

Will you now permit me, in this informal way, to add a few things, which the perusal of your Note has suggested to me?

I am unable to reconcile the first passage of your Note, with another in the body of your Sermon. In the former, you say, "We are told by Trinitarians, that Jesus Christ is the Supreme God, the same being as the Father, and that a leading end of Christianity is to reveal him in this character." In the latter you say, "According to this doctrine (that is, the doctrine of the Trinity) there are three infinite and equal persons, possessing supreme divinity, and called Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Each of these persons, as described by theologians, has his own particular consciousness, will, and perceptions. They love each other, converse with each other, and delight in each other's society. They perform different parts in man's redemption, each having his appropriate office, and neither doing the work of the other. The Son is mediator, and not the Father. The Father sends the Son, and is not himself sent; nor is he conscious, like the Son, of taking flesh. Here, then, we have three intelligent agents, possessed of different consciousnesses, different wills, and different perceptions, performing different acts, and sustaining different relations; and if these things do not imply and constitute three minds or beings, we are utterly at a loss to know how three minds or beings are to be formed."

But how can Trinitarians maintain that Jesus Christ is the "*same being as the Father*," when a prominent trait of their doctrine is, that there is a *distinction* between him and the Father. You yourself represent them as holding this distinction to be equal to that which exists between two different men. This indeed is incorrect; but it is equally so to represent them as holding that Jesus Christ is the "*same being as the Father*," if you mean by this, *in all respects the same.*

Nor can I see the propriety of the remark in your Note, that if Christ were "the same being as the Father —— we should expect to hear him continually spoken of as the Supreme God." For, *first*, are we to receive the Book of God as it is, or are we at liberty to insist that it must be conformed to our *expectations?* and *secondly*, If Christ was truly man (a point as certain as that Christ ever existed,) and was conversant in the *human nature* with men, how, in a book which gives us the history of what he said and did during his *incarnation*, should we expect to hear him continually spoken of as the *Supreme God?* The reasonableness of such an expectation seems to be at least very questionable.

In truth, the sacred writers do not appear to me to write as controversialists, on the subject of Christ's divinity. It is the way with men, who have extravagant views of the importance of any particular subject, to be ever dwelling upon it, and taking occasion to introduce it as often as possible. Thus I have heard some preachers, who will not utter a single public discourse, or offer a single prayer, without letting it be known of all men, that they are *champions* for the doctrine of the Trinity. I have heard others who never fail to let their hearers know that they are emancipated from the thraldom of the dark ages; and have thrown off the shackles of creeds and confessions, and forms imposed by ignorant and bigoted men; that they are enlightened and *reasonable* Christians; and that their audience are bound in duty to become their imitators. The holy apostles, however, possessed, as I must believe, none of the spirit which prompts to either of these courses. They did not view the subject in a distorted and sectarian light. The edifice of truth — the temple of the living God — rose under their hands not only into a lofty and magnificent structure, but into one which was as conspicuous for *symmetry* as for grandeur.

All parts of Christian doctrine held their proper place in the system which they taught. Why should they then be *continually* speaking of Christ as Supreme God, when (as I verily believe) they expected no professed follower of Christ to call this doctrine in question? John seems to have had opponents to it in his eye, when he wrote the first verse of his Gospel; but, excepting this, I do not remember another passage of the New Testament which has this aspect of opposition to gainsayers, in regard to the divinity of Christ. The apostles doubtless expected to be believed, when they had *once* plainly asserted any thing. That they are not, is indeed to be lamented; but it cannot be charged to their fault. They felt (what we feel now) that very frequent, strong, and direct asseverations of any thing are apt to produce a suspicion in the mind of a hearer or reader, that the person making them has not arguments on which he relies, and so substitutes confident affirmations in their room; or that he is himself but imperfectly satisfied with the cause which he defends; or that he has sinister motives in view. For myself, I confess I am inclined to suspect a man of all these, who makes very frequent and confident asseverations.

I am the more satisfied, then, that the New Testament treats the subject in question as one which was not controverted, and as one which was not expected to be called in question. My conclusion, from the apostle's mode of treating it, is, I acknowledge, quite different from that which you draw, as stated in your Sermon and Note. But, with my present views, I must think it to be more probable than yours.

In regard to what follows in your Note, most of it has been anticipated. I will touch upon only a few points.

With respect to the passages which we adduce in proof of Christ's divine nature, you observe, that the "strength of the Trinitarian argument lies in those in which Jesus is called God." This may be true; but it lies in them, as I have from the first endeavoured to shew, not simply because the name *God* is given to him, but because those things are ascribed to him as God, which no being but the Supreme God can perform. *My whole argument is constructed on this ground:* your whole Note, on the ground that we draw our conclusion simply from the fact, that the appellation *God* is given to Christ.

What you say respecting the argument in favour of Christ's divine nature, from the *name given him* in Mat. i. 23, accords in the main with my own views. To maintain that the name *Immanuel* proves the doctrine in question, is a fallacious argument; although many Trinitarians have urged it. Jerusalem is called "Jehovah our righteousness." Is Jerusalem therefore *divine?*

Why should you say, in the third paragraph of your Note, that, in looking through "Matthew, Mark, and Luke, you meet with no instance in which Christ is called God?" Are there no proofs here of his omniscience, of his omnipotence, of his authority to forgive sin, of his supreme, legislative right? And are not these things better proof of his divine nature than a mere name can be? Why, moreover, should such an invidious distinction be implied, to the prejudice of John's writings and of the Epistles? Do you not admit all the New Testament to be of divine origin and authority? Of what importance, then, is it, whether the doctrine of Christ's divinity is found in one part or another? Besides, if any disciple could know who the Lord in reality was, has any one a better claim to be considered as knowing it than John, the disciple "who leaned on Jesus' bosom?"

You have passed the whole of John, i. 1, with merely commenting on the *name* Θεος. My dear Sir, can you expect to satisfy candid inquirers with this? Are you not bound to tell us how this *Logos* (*word*) could *create the worlds* (*τα παντα*, the universe,) before this text is disposed of? You must tell us how *creative power*—the highest, the distinguishing act of Deity, which constitutes the characteristic and prominent feature of the true God, in distinction from all false Gods, (Is. xl. 26, and onward)—can be *delegated?* When you can explain this, then you will bring us upon ground where we shall be unable to controvert the Gnostics, who denied that the Jehovah of the Old Testament is the Supreme God. *Inferior* power, they maintained, was competent to create the world. What less do they who ascribe *creation* to Christ, and yet reject his divinity?

Why should you pass over all that on which we rely for proof, and touch only that on which we do not profess to place confident reliance? I mean, why should you descant on the *name* God, and say nothing of the attributes and works ascribed to him who bears this name? If we should argue in the same manner with you, ought we to expect to convince you? Much less could we acquit our consciences of our obligation to represent the opinions of others fairly to the world, should we publish any thing by which we should endeavour to make them believe that *all* the evidence in favour of a particular doctrine held by many Christians, consisted in that very thing *on which they did not rely;* or at most, in that which constituted merely but a part of their grounds of belief.

The simile from Plato and Socrates, I must think, is less happily chosen than your fine taste and cultivated mind commonly lead you to choose. In the same breath that you say, "Plato was in the beginning with Socrates, and was Socrates," you add, "that whoever saw and heard Plato, saw and heard, not Plato, but Socrates, and that as long as Plato lived, Socrates lived and taught:" That is, your first sentence would either not be at all understood, or understood, of course, in a sense totally different from that which you meant to convey, unless you added the commentary along with the sentence. John has indeed added a commentary; but this is, as *he means to call Christ* THE GOD WHO CREATED THE UNIVERSE. Of this commentary you have taken no notice: But of this you are bound to take notice, if you mean to convince those who differ from you, or to deal ingenuously with those whom you design to instruct.

On the texts, John, xx. 28; Acts, xx. 28; Rom. ix. 5; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. i. 6; and John, v. 20. I have already said what I wish to say at present. The remarks in your Note do not seem to call for any new investigation.

You say (near the close of your Note,) that you have "collected all the passages in the New Testament in which Jesus is *supposed* to be called God." The foregoing Letter, however, does represent us as *supposing* that there are *still more* in which he is called God,—although I have omitted many in which a multitude of Trinitarians have *supposed* that Christ is called God. Why should you affirm this, when nearly every book on the doctrine of the Trinity, that ever has been published by Trinitarians, will contradict it?

You repeat also the assertion here, "that in two or three passages, the title (of God) may be given him (Christ:) but in every case it is given in connections and under circumstances which imply that it is not to be received in its highest and most literal sense."

But in no single instance have you noticed the "connections and circumstances," in which the appellation *God* is bestowed on Christ. Can you reasonably expect your thinking readers will take this assertion upon credit? Are you not bound to prove to these same readers, *by the Scriptures, interpreted according to the universal laws of explaining human language*, that the New Testament writers have not ascribed to Christ CREATIVE *power, omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, divine worship, divine honours*, and *eternal existence?* What are *names* in this dispute? Shew that these *attributes* are NOT ascribed to Christ, and you make us Unitarians at once. You ought not to take the advantage of representing our arguments as consisting in that on which we do not place reliance; and then intimate to your readers, "This is all which Trinitarians have to allege in their own favour." Dispute can never be terminated in this way. Meet fairly and openly the points in debate. Many of your readers are certainly too intelligent, and too conscientious, to be satisfied with any other course. Any other does not become your high character and distinguished talents.

THE END.

EDINBURGH:
Printed by ANDREW SHORTREDE, Thistle Lane.

MOSES UNVEILED;

OR,

THOSE FIGURES WHICH SERVED UNTO THE PATTERN AND SHADOW
OF HEAVENLY THINGS POINTING OUT THE MESSIAH
CHRIST JESUS, BRIEFLY EXPLAINED.

WHEREUNTO IS ADDED,

THE HARMONY OF ALL THE PROPHETS,

BREATHING WITH ONE MOUTH THE MYSTERY OF HIS COMING,
AND THAT REDEMPTION WHICH BY HIS DEATH
HE WAS TO ACCOMPLISH.

TO CONFIRM THE CHRISTIAN AND CONVINCE THE JEW.

BY WILLIAM GUILD,

MINISTER OF GOD'S WORD AT KING-EDWARD IN SCOTLAND.

For the law had the shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things themselves.
HEB. x. 1.

PREFACE.

THE object of this valuable little Treatise is to prove that the person, offices, and history of our Saviour were expressly typified in the sacrifices and ceremonies of the Mosaic institutions, and in the leading features of character which distinguished the prophets, judges, and patriarchs of the Jewish nation; and it has for its subject the illustration of this truth by a series of ingenious parallelisms. Where an occasional *disparity* exists, it is subjoined, to prevent our pushing the parallel too far. The leading idea is that which pervades the Epistle to the Hebrews, viz. to shew that Jesus Christ is the great antitype prefigured in every part of the Jewish economy, and consequently that the Christian faith is not, as the Jews affected to consider it, a new religion, different from, and inconsistent with, the revelation which they already possessed, but that it is in reality a part, and the crowning part, of that revelation, dictated by the same Spirit, resting on the same evidences, significant of the same mercies, and demonstrating, in its whole tenor and consistency, that it was the same God who "at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past to the fathers by the prophets, that had in those last days spoken to them by his Son." The illustrations used by our author are sometimes a little fanciful; but generally, they are both pertinent and authorized either by the language of Scripture itself or by the glosses of the most orthodox divines.

Although, as the title of his work implies, the author draws the subjects of his parallel chiefly from the books of Moses, he also brings in David, and the other scripture worthies who are recorded as types of the Messiah.

His Supplementary Treatise on "The Harmony of all the Prophets," &c. is an admirable companion to the "Moses Unveiled;" and did we not know, by our own experience, and from observation, that without the special direction of the Spirit of Grace, the best wit of man is but "a razor that shaveth deceitfully," we might justly wonder how any intelligent Deist, more especially how any candid Jew, can resist the evidence here exhibited as to the divine character and mission of our Saviour. But whatever effect the labours of the pious author may have in convincing the unbeliever, they cannot fail to edify those who are already disposed to consider the law as "having a shadow of good things to come," and to regard Jesus of Nazareth as that Divine Person to whom "all the prophets gave witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

H. B.

MOSES UNVEILED.

I. *The Tree of Life*, Genesis, ii. 9.

THE CONGRUITY.

1. As it was called the Tree of Life.—So Christ is that true Tree of Life, giving the fruit and juice, both of grace and glory, John, xv. 1.

2. It was in the midst of the garden.—So Christ is to be found in the midst of his church, Mat. xviii. 20.

3. It was planted in the earthly paradise.—So Christ is placed in the heavenly, Col. iii. 1—4.; Phil. iii. 20.

4. Adam in his standing might eat of the Tree of Life, as of all other trees, saving that one which was forbidden, Gen. ii. 16.—So shall the godly that persevere, eat of that true Tree of Life promised, Rev. ii. 7.

5. Sin exiled man out of the earthly paradise, from the fruition of the one, Gen. iii. 24.—So sin doth out of the heavenly, from the fruition of the other, John, xv. 6.

6. Adam condemned once to be expelled from the same, got no regress, Gen. iii. 24.—So man in judgment once debarred from heaven and Christ, shall have no recovery, Mat. xxv. 41.

7. The Lord only planted the one, making it to grow out of the earth.—So also did he the other in the earth of our humanity, John, i. 14, who did increase in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man, Luke, ii. 52.

THE DISPARITY.

First, That Tree of Life endured but for a time: but our Tree of Life endureth for ever, Heb. vii. 24. Secondly, It could not restore life again to Adam, being only the sacrament of the covenant of life in case of perseverance: but our Tree of Life, Christ Jesus, restoreth life lost to his own chosen; yea, a better life than Adam's in paradise. And since he is the end of the law to them that believe, Rom. x. 4, he now becomes to us by the Covenant of Grace, the true Tree of Life, performing that which the covenant of works could not attain unto, by reason of man's fall.

II. *Adam*, Genesis, v. 2.

1. Adam, man, red earth, or bloody.—So was Christ man in his incarnation, and bloody in his passion, Mat. i. and xxvii.

2. Adam, man, without woman's bearing, and so without a mother.—So Christ, man, without man's begetting, and so without a father, Mat. i. 20.; Luke, i. 34.

3. Adam's father only God, Gen. ii. 7.—So likewise Christ's, John, viii. 19, 42.; Heb. i. 5.

4. Adam made lord over the creatures, and heir of the outward bounds of the earth.—So is Christ that truly, Psalm, ii. 8.; John, iii. 35.; Heb. ii. 8.

5. Adam was appointed to dress the garden and keep it, Gen. ii. 15.—So Christ, to sanctify and save his church, 1 Cor. i. 30.; Eph. v. 26, 27.

6. Adam was sent out of paradise, for his sin committed, to endure painful labours, Gen. iii. 23; but unwillingly.—So was Christ sent from the heavens, for our sins imputed, to endure painful sufferings, Isaiah, liii. yet most willingly.

7. Thorns were made a curse to the one, Gen. iii. 18.—So were they made a crown to the other, Mat. xxvii. 29.

8. The sweat of the brow was in labour imposed on the one, Gen. iii. 19.—So the sweat of blood in agony was imposed on the other, Luke, xxii. 44.

9. Adam sleeping, Eve was formed, Gen. ii. 21.—So Christ dying on the cross, his church was framed.

10. Adam gives to his, that which is his own by generation, Gen. v. 3.—So Christ doth to his, that which is his own, by regeneration, Rom. vi. 4, 5; xi. 16.

11. We have borne already here the image of the earthly.—So shall we bear the image of the heavenly, 1 Cor. xv. 49.

12. Adam created in the image of God, Gen. i. 27.—So Christ incarnate, the engraven character of his Father, Col. i. 15.; Heb. i. 3.

13. Adam was king, priest, and prophet, in his family.—So is Christ the same in his Church, and family of the faithful, Acts, iii. 22—26.; John, xviii. 37.; Heb. iv. 14, 15; ix. 11.

14. Adam had Cain and Abel in his house, Gen. iv.—So hath Christ elect and reprobates, true worshippers and hypocrites in his visible Church, John, x.

15. Adam had perfect wisdom and knowledge, as may be seen in his naming of all the creatures, Gen. ii. 19.—So in Christ dwelleth the full treasure of both, Col. ii. 3.

16. Likewise as by the offence of one, judgment came on all men to condemnation, (and many were made sinners.)—Even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men, to justification of life; so that by his obedience shall many be made righteous, Rom. v. 18, 19; that as sin had reigned unto death, so might grace also reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord, Rom. v. 21.

THE DISPARITY.

But yet the gift is not so as is the offence; for if, through the offence of Adam, many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. Neither is the gift so, as that which entered in by one that sinned. For the fault came of one offence unto condemnation; but the gift is of many offences unto justification. For if, by the offence of one, death reigned through one, much more shall they which receive that abundance of grace, and gift of that righteousness, reign in life through one, that is, Jesus Christ, Rom. v. 15, 16, 17. Likewise the first man was of the earth, earthy and natural; but the second man is the Lord from heaven, heavenly and spiritual, 1 Cor. xv. 47; and as is the earthy, such are they that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they that are heavenly, ver. 48. Also the first man Adam was made a living soul, but the last Adam was made a quickening spirit, 1 Cor. xv. 45.

III. *Abel*, Genesis, iv.

1. Abel, or Habel, mourning or vanity.—Such was the life of Christ, a mourning for our vanity and wickedness, Isa. liii. 3, 4.; Mat. xxvi. 38.; 1 Pet. ii. 21—24.

2. Abel offered an acceptable sacrifice unto the Lord, Genesis, iv. 4.; Heb. xi. 4.—So did Christ upon the altar of the cross, Heb. ix. 14, when he offered up himself, Heb. vii. 27.

3. Abel was a shepherd, Genesis, iv. 2.—So Christ is the true Shepherd of our souls, 1 Peter, ii. 25.

4. Abel was slain by his brother Cain in the field innocently, after he had spoken to him, Genesis, iv. 8.—So was Christ by his brethren according to the flesh (the Jews) without the city, after they had falsely accused him, Luke, xxiii.; Heb. xiii. 12.

5. After Abel's death till Seth and Enoch, true worship and religion by Cain's seed was long time suppressed, Genesis, iv. 26.—So after Christ's death was Christianity under the heathen emperors long persecuted, Rev. xii. Eusebius.

6. And as after the restoration of true worship, corruption of life crept in, and brought the deluge upon the primitive world, Gen. vi. and vii.—So after the truth was by law established under Christian emperors, (open persecution ceasing,) secretly and slyly corruption of life and doctrine crept in, and brought a deluge of miseries and darkness upon the visible Church. *Centuriæ Ecclesiæ.*

THE DISPARITY.

Abel's sacrifice was only for himself; but that of Christ's for the sins of the world. Abel was privily murdered; but Christ publicly suffered. Abel's blood cried to the Lord for revenge and wrath; but the blood of sprinkling shed by Christ, speaketh better things than that of Abel, Heb. xii. 24.

IV. *Enoch*, Genesis, v. 21.

1. Enoch, dedicate.—So was Christ dedicate and decreed to be the Saviour of mankind, Isaiah, xxv. 9.

2. Enoch walked with God, Genesis, v. 22.—So did Christ in all perfection of sanctimony and righteousness, John, viii. 29.; 1 Pet. ii. 22.

3. Enoch pleased God, and was beloved of him, Heb. xi. 5.—So did Christ his Father, and is declared to be his well beloved, in whom he was well pleased, Mat. iii. 17.

4. Enoch was matchless in his age, so that none was like him, Eccl'us. xlix. 14.—So was Christ, through all ages, and ever shall be, peerless, none daring to compare with him, John, iii. 35.

5. In order of history, take those that died first, he is reported and brought in as one that saw not death, but was translated, Gen. v. 24.—To yield that comfort to the Church, and typify Christ therein, who should make death to be swallowed up in victory and immortality, and to assure us also of the resurrection, Rom. iv. 25.; 1 Cor. xv. 54.

THE DISPARITY.

Enoch's righteousness did not avail others, but that of our Saviour doth avail us, and becometh others. His translation likewise was comfortative and typical, but the resurrection of Christ to us is operative and effectual.

Note also, that Enoch's translation before the law, and Elijah's under the law, are types and pledges as it were of the last translation of those who, under the gospel, shall be found alive at the Lord's second coming.

V. *Noah*, Genesis, v. 29.

1. Noah, ceasing, or rest.—So Christ hath caused God's wrath to cease, and giveth rest thereby to the troubled conscience.

2. Noah lived in a most corrupt time, and general defection both in doctrine and manners, Gen. vi. 5.—So did Christ Jesus upon earth in a like age, as appears, Mat. v. vi. vii.

3. Noah was acquainted with the Lord's decree, Gen. vi. 13.—So was Christ fully with the will of his Father, John, xii. 49, 50.

4. Noah was a preacher of righteousness to the wicked world, 2 Peter, ii. 5.—So was Christ the same, exhorting them to repent, for the kingdom of God was at hand, Matt. iv. 17.; Mar. i. 14, 15.

5. Noah, by his obedience, saved all that entered within his ark, Gen. vii. 23.—So doth Christ all those that, by a true faith, do enter into his Church, 1 Tim. i. 15.

6. Noah's ark was tossed upon the waters. —So is the Church of Christ in this world, by divers temptations and persecutions, John, xvi. 2. 20, 21. 33.

7. In Noah's ark were clean and unclean, "Shem, Ham, and Japheth," Gen. vii. 13, 14. —So in Christ's visible Church are hypocrites and true believers, Jews also and Gentiles, Gal. ii. 4.; Jude, 4.

8. Noah only, as principal efficient, did build his ark, Gen. vi. 14.—So doth Christ edify, and build up his Church, Heb. iii. 3—6.

9. Noah was long in building thereof, 1 Pet. ii. 20.—So hath Christ been from the beginning of the world hitherto, and shall be to the world's end, Eph. iv. 8—13, in building of his Church.

10. Noah having built his ark, the flood did come, which destroyed the first world, vii. 21.—So the number of Christ's Church being accomplished, the fire shall come to destroy the second world.

11. Noah made his ark of many trees, closely eamed together, strong, fresh, and dressed, Gen. vi. 14.—So hath Christ compacted his Church of many members, united by the bond of the Spirit, strengthened with grace, reed from the damning corruption of sin, nd sanctified by the Holy Ghost, Eph. iv. 16.

12. Noah had sundry rooms in his ark, bid.—So Christ hath sundry functions in is Church, 1 Cor. xii. 4—31.

13. Noah pitched his ark within and without against the waters.—So hath Christ ortified his Church sufficiently against all emptations, John, xv. 10, 11.; 1 Cor. x. 13.

14. Noah made one door only to his ark, er. 16.—So hath Christ appointed one only ntry to his Church, John, x. 7.

15. Noah's ark had little outward light, Ibid. -So neither is the light of Christ's Church, orldly carnal wisdom, 1 Cor. i. and ii.

16. Noah abode in the ark all the time of he tossing thereof.—So doth Christ remain n the midst of his Church, being with them the world's end, in all temptations and fflictions thereof, Matt. xxviii. 20.

17. Noah saved few in his ark, in respect of the world.—So the number that are to be saved in Christ's Church, is but a handful likewise, Matt. xxii. 14.

18. The wrights that built the ark, notwithstanding perished.—So many preachers in the Church may likewise be damned, Matt. vii. 22.

19. All sorts of creatures Noah received into the ark.—So all sorts of persons and nations, Christ accepteth into his Church, Acts, x. 28.

20. In the days of Noah, defection from true religion, oppression, sensuality, and security, after 1656 years, brought on the first destruction on the world.—So the like sins now reigning, about the like time, is like to bring on the second judgment on the latter world, Matt. xxiv.

21. Those were saved by being within the ark on the waters.—Figuring that those that are redeemed, must enter into the Church by baptism, 1 Peter, iii. 21.

22. Noah's tossings upon the waters being ended, he sent out the dove, Gen. viii. 12.—So Christ's sufferings being finished, he sent out his Spirit into the world, to comfort and lead his own, John, xvi. 7.

23. Noah offered a sacrifice unto the Lord, wherein he smelled a savour of rest, Gen. viii. 21.—So hath Christ unto his Father, whereby his wrath is fully appeased, Rom. iii. 25.

24. With Noah God made a covenant to his posterity, and confirmed it with a sign, Gen. ix. 9. 17.—So in Christ with the Church hath the Lord made a new covenant of mercy, and ratified it with sacraments.

25. The cover of the ark being taken off, and Noah's family going out of the same, after the deluge dried up, increased and multiplied wonderfully, Gen. x.—So the time of the true Church's lurking being ended, and the hid marked ones bursting forth, after the deluge of darkness dried up to a good measure, the Church shall become more and more visible, and increase to the abridging of antichrist's power daily, Rev. xix.

THE DISPARITY.

Noah preached, but converted none of the first world; but not so Christ, by whose voice many were turned, and daily by the efficacy thereof, are brought into his Church. Noah's ark likewise putrified and perished at last; but never shall the Church of Christ so perish or decay. The tossing of the waters did wear and make the ark worse: but trials and afflictions do better ever the Church, Psalm cxix.

VI. *Abraham*, Genesis, xii.

1. Abram, and Abraham, a high father, and a father of a multitude.—So is Christ a high and heavenly father of the multitude of his faithful, Isaiah, ix. 6.

2. Abraham went out of his native country and father's house at God's command, Genesis, xii. 4.—So Christ, according to the decree of the Father, left the heavens, and took painful journeys on earth, to work man's redemption, John, iii. 16, 17. ; Heb. x. 5—10.

3. To Abraham and his seed God promised Canaan, ver. 7.—So to Christ his spiritual seed hath he granted heaven.

4. Abraham delivered Lot and many captives by a great victory, Gen. xiv. 16.—So Christ hath delivered his chosen from sin, Satan, and damnation, and freed them wonderfully, Luke, i. 71. ; 1 Cor. xv. 37.

5. Abraham and his family behoved to be circumcised, Gen. xvii. 23.—So Christ, his Church, behoveth to be sanctified, Isaiah, iv. 3.

6. Abraham was king, priest, and prophet in his own family.—So is Christ Jesus in his Church the same, Zech. 14. 9. ; Luke, xxiv. 19. ; Heb. ix. 11.

7. The Lord revealed to Abraham the purpose of his will, Gen. xviii. 17.—So hath he the same in all things perfectly unto his son Jesus, John, xviii. 4.

8. Abraham interceded for the righteous in Sodom, Gen. xviii. 25, and for the wicked for their sake.—So is Christ a mediator continually for the godly in the world, Heb. 8. 6. John, xvii. 9, as he spares also even the wicked for their sake, and prayed for them that crucified him.

9. Abraham was obedient in all things to God, even to the offering up of him, who was his own flesh and blood, upon Mount Moriah, Gen. xxii.—So was Christ even unto death, and immolation of himself unto the Father upon Mount Golgotha, Phil. ii. 8.

10. Abraham put Hagar and Ishmael out of his house, Gen. xxi. 14.—So shall Christ expel out of his kingdom all bastard hypocrites, despisers, and mockers of the godly, Mat. xxii. 12, 13. ; Rev. xxi. 8.

11. God delivered Lot for Abraham's sake, with his family, from the fire of Sodom, Gen. xix.—So hath the Lord the godly for Christ's sake, from the condemnation of the wicked, 1 John, ii. 2.

12. Abraham called heir of the world, Rom. iv. 13, and father of the faithful.—So is Christ Jesus the same most properly and truly, Psal. ii. 8. ; Heb. i. 8—13.

13. To Abraham it was said, In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, Gen. xii. 3.—Which is only in Christ Jesus fully accomplished, Acts, iii. 25, 26. ; Gal. iii. 8.

THE DISPARITY.

From obscureness of estate in Ur of the Chaldees, to an honourable and eminent estate in Canaan, Abraham was brought ; but from a glorious estate in highest majesty, to a base condition in ignominy, was our Saviour brought for us. Abraham's wife was barren ; but not so is the Church of Christ, which must be fruitful in good works. She was taken from Abraham ; but none can take the sheep of Christ out of his hand, which are his spouse.

VII. *Circumcision typifying Baptism, our Sanctification, and Christ's blood which is our inward washing*, Gen. xvii.

1. Circumcision was the sign of God's covenant to Israel, Gen. xvii. 11.—So Baptism is the same to the Church, even a sign and seal of the covenant of mercy, 1 Peter, iii. 21.

2. It was Abraham and his household that was comprehended in the one, ver. 13.—So is it Christ Jesus his Church that is comprehended in the other, 1 Pet. iii. 21.

3. Not only was Isaac, but Ishmael also circumcised ; the born and the bought ; the children and the hirelings, Ibid.—So, not only are the Godly baptized outwardly in the visible Church, but the wicked also : not only the redeemed number, but the natural sort, the true children, and those that are but hirelings, Rom. iii. 22.

4. Whosoever was not circumcised, having the covenant in his flesh, was cut off from Israel, ver. 14.—So, whosoever contemns baptism, yea, is not in the spirit renewed, is not a true member of the Church of God, Matt. xxviii. 19. 20.

5. There was a circumcision of the flesh which availed not, being alone ; and there was a circumcision of the heart which made the true Israelite, Rom. ii. 28.—So there is an outward baptism by elementary water, which of the body and being alone avails not, and there is an inward baptism of the soul or spirit, which makes the true Christian, Mark, i. 8 ; xvi. 16 ; Rom. iv. 1.

6. In circumcision there was a cutting away of the foreskin by blood.—Signifying that even so it is by the blood of Christ that our sins are taken away, and by the spirit of sanctification that we are renewed, mortifying sin, and quickening grace in us, Eph. v. 26.

7. It was painful to flesh and blood.—So is mortification and abandoning of fleshly concupiscence to the carnal man at first, John, iii. ; Col. iii. 5.

8. Infants were circumcised, ver. 10.—So also are they to be baptized, Mark, x. 14. Rom. iii. 3.

VIII. *Isaac*, Genesis, xxi.

1. Isaac, or Yitschak, laughter or rejoicing.—So is Christ true matter of joyful laughter and rejoicing to all the faithful, Isaiah, lxi. 10.

2. Isaac, the son of the father of the faithful, Gen. xvii. 19.—So is Christ the only natural Son of God, on whom all the faithful call Abba Father, Matt. iii. 17. Rom. viii. 15.

3. Isaac, against the course of nature, born of the dead womb of old Sarah, Gen. xxi. 3.; Rom. iv. 19.—So was Christ born of the inviolate womb of a chaste virgin, Matt. i. 23. as all those that are his likewise are born, not of blood, nor of the will of flesh, nor of man, but of God, John, i. 13.

4. Isaac, the seed of promise made unto Abraham, and born in his old age at the time appointed, Gen. xviii. 14.—So is Christ the same most properly, in whom all the nations of the earth are blessed: born in the fulness of time decreed.

5. An angel announceth the birth of the one in Sarah's hearing, who thinks it impossible, Gen. xviii. 12.—So an angel doth our Saviour's birth to Mary, who likewise saith, How shall this be? Luke, i. 34.

6. Isaac was circumcised the eighth day, and in his infancy persecuted by Ishmael, Gen. xxi. 4.—So likewise was Christ, Luke, ii. 21, and immediately thereafter persecuted by Herod, Mat. ii.

7. Isaac willingly yielded himself to be a burnt-offering to the Lord, Gen. xxii.—Even so did Christ, in laying down his life for satisfying his Father's justice, John, x. 18.

8. Isaac carried the wood whereon he was bound to Moriah, ver. 6.—So did Christ the cross whereon he was nailed to Golgotha, John, xix. 17.

9. Thus Isaac was obedient to his father even unto death.—Even so was Christ that most truly, Phil. ii. 8.

10. Isaac came the third day to the place of immolation, ver. 4.—So did Christ to his suffering in the thirty-third year of his age, or thereby, consisting of three tens and three units; as also neither in the time of the law of nature, nor in the written law, but in the time of grace, even that perfect fulness of time decreed.

11. Isaac only got the heritage to him and his; and Ishmael, with others, the moveables, Gen. xxv. 5, 6.—So hath Christ the heavenly inheritance prepared only for his chosen; the wicked's portion being worldly things, Psalm cvi. 15.

12. Isaac had Esau and Jacob, who struggled in the womb of Rebecca, Gen. xxv. 22. —So Christ hath elect and reprobates in his visible Church, who disagree in manners, Mat. xxii. 11—14.

13. Isaac's wife was taken of one kindred with himself, Gen. xxiv. 4.—So is Christ's Church of that same flesh and nature which he did assume, Matt. i. 23.; Heb. ii. 14.

14. Isaac's wife was fair, Gen. xxvi. 7.—So is Christ's Church beautiful within, Rev. xxi.

15. She was wooed by his father's servant, and brought unto him, Gen. xxiv.—So is the Church by the true pastors, and brought unto Christ, *dipensatione verbi.* 2 Cor. v. 20.

16. She forsaketh all, and vailed cometh to her husband adorned with his jewels that were given unto her, Gen. xxiv. 65.—So must the Church forsake all in preferment of affection; and, in humility, decked with his graces, must come unto Christ, Psalm xlv. 10—17.

17. Isaac meeteth his wife coming to him, Gen. xxiv. 63.—So doth Christ, his Church, with preventing grace and acceptation, Eph.ii.

18. Her name was Rebekah, which is, fed, ver. 64.—So is Christ his Church, with that heavenly food and comfort of his Word, Cant. ii. 5.; John, vi. 48—63.

19. Isaac brought her into the tent of his mother, and was comforted after her death, ver. 67.—So Christ hath brought the Church of the Gentiles in the place of the Jews, of whom he was born, and doth rejoice concerning their ingrafting, Rom. xi. 11—28.

20. Isaac was offered, and yet died not; for he was received from death after a sort, Heb. xi. 19.—So Christ, God and man in one person, was offered, and yet, according to his Godhead, died not; but by virtue thereof in his manhood rose from the dead, Matt. xxviii. 6.

21. In the hand of the father, to the sacrificing, was carried the knife and the fire, Gen. xxii. 6.—So to the cross and immolation of Christ, in the hand of his Father, likewise went sharp justice, and fervent love withal concurring, Matt. xxvi.

THE DISPARITY.

Isaac being waxed old, and through the dimness of his eyes, not being able to discern or see, was deceived by Jacob, who got so the blessing of his elder brother Esau; but our unalterable all-seeing Jesus can never be deceived to bestow the blessing upon one for another, or place the same wrong.

The Allegory of the Blessing, Genesis, xxvii.

As Isaac loved Esau the elder; so did Christ the Jews, whom longing to gather under his wings, he called in the latter time, and craved of them that meat which his soul loved, whereof he spoke when he said, My meat is to do the will of the Father: but they went out, having not yet returned, and in the mean while the Gentiles (the younger brother) entered in, not daring to do so by their own presumption: but persuaded by the promises of grace, having the savoury meat of the merit of their Saviour's death to offer, which they found not without in the world, but prepared within in the Church, and so clothed with the garments of the elder, which is adoption and right to the promises, their neck and hands covered with the skin of the kid, which is the remembrance of their sins that killed their Saviour, or which is his perfect righteousness, they smelled sweetly before their Father, through free acceptation, and obtained the fruitfulness of grace, with the assurance of the remission of their sins, wherein the blessing consists.

IX. *Melchisedeck*, Gen. xiv.

1. Melchisedeck, a king of righteousness.—So is Christ that truly, Rev. xv.; Heb. vii. 2.

2. Also king of Salem, or peace.—So is Christ Jesus our prince of peace, Isaiah, ix. 6. Heb. vii. 2.

3. He was the priest of the most high God, Gen. xiv. 18.—So likewise is Christ, made not after the carnal commandment, but after the power of endless life, Heb. vii. 16.

4. He was without father or mother, (namely, mentioned,) Heb. vii. 3.—So Christ as God is ἀμήτωϱ, motherless, and as man ἀπάτωϱ, without a father.

5. He was without kindred, Ibid.—So likewise Christ according to his Deity.

6. He was of another order than Aaron.—So also Christ, (and of the same order with Melchisedeck,) Heb. vii. 16. to shew the imperfection of the priesthood of Levi, ver. 11. and the necessity of the change of the law, ver. 12.

7. He continueth priest for ever, and hath neither beginning of days, nor end of life, (to wit, mentioned,) Heb. vii. 3.—So doth Christ continue our high-priest for ever, whose priesthood cannot pass from one to another; and therefore is able perfectly to save them that come to God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them, Heb. vii. 24, 25. and whose priesthood is confirmed by an oath, Psal. cx. 4. to shew that by so much is Jesus made a surety of a better Testament, Heb. vii. 21, 22.

8. He received tithe of all from Abraham, and blessed him, in whose loins Levi was, Gen. xiv. 20.—To shew thereby, that as therein he was greater than Abraham, Heb. vii. 7. so the excellency and greatness of our high-priest Jesus, above Levi or the priesthood of the law, (being of one order, as is said, with Melchisedeck,) by bringing in a better hope, whereby we draw near to God, and being himself undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens, Heb. vii. 19, 26.

9. He gave bread and wine to refresh Abraham and his company after the battle, and not that he offered up the same as any sacrifice, Gen. xiv. 18.—So Christ doth give his body and blood for the refreshment of the faithful receivers which once already himself offered up as an all-sufficient sacrifice upon the cross, never again to be repeated, Heb. vii. 27.

10. Melchisedeck was greater than Abraham; and consequently, than all Israel, which then was in his loins, Heb. vii. 7.—So Christ is greater and more excellent than the Church or his mystical body, he being the head thereof, Zech. xiv. 9.

11. Melchisedeck was but one of his order only before or under the law.—So is Christ that one only priest of his order under the Gospel, to offer up propitiatory sacrifice unto the Father, needing no successors therein, seeing he is immortal, and is consecrated for evermore, Heb. vii. 24, 28.

THE DISPARITY.

Melchisedeck was man only, and consequently sinful; but our high-priest is God and man, sinless, and therefore needed not to offer for himself. Again, Melchisedeck's priesthood was not confirmed with an oath unto him, as was Christ's, as is said, and the reason given. Melchisedeck, also, had Christ succeeding to him in the same order; but Christ shall have none unto or over him. He gave bodily refreshment only to Abraham and his family; but Christ gives both corporal and spiritual to his elect.

X. *Jacob*, Genesis, xxv.

1. Jacob, a supplanter.—So is Christ of death, sin, and Satan, &c. Col. ii. 15. Luke, i. 71.

2. Also, he was called Israel, a prince of God, or prevailing with God, Gen. xxxii. 28.—So is Christ that heavenly prince, prevailing at his Father's hands by his intercession for all good things to his own, Heb. viii. 6—13.

3. He purchased the birthright by red pottage, and obtained the blessing by presenting savoury venison unto his father, clothed in Esau's garment, Gen. xxv. 29—34. and xxvii. 6—29.—So hath Christ purchased heaven's inheritance to us by his red blood, and obtained the blessing by offering up the savoury merit of his obedience in the borrowed garment of our nature, Rom. iii. 24.

4. He was a plain man, and abode in tents, Gen. xxv. 27.—So was Christ plain, meek, and merciful, frequenting the company of men and sinners, Matt. ix. 11, and xii. 18, 19.

5. Jacob was hated and persecuted by Esau, Gen. xxvii. 41.—So was Christ by Satan, and the Scribes and Pharisees, albeit they were his brethren according to the flesh.

6. He leaves his father's house, and goeth to serve in Haran, Gen. xxviii. 10.—So Christ left the glorious heavens, and came in the shape of a servant unto the earth, Phil. ii. 6, 7.

7. In his persecution by Esau, by the way he seeth the angels of God ascending and descending unto him, ver. 12.—So after Christ's temptation in the wilderness by Satan, the angels came and ministered to him, Matt. iv.

8. Jacob was a shepherd, Gen. xxix.—So is Christ the shepherd of our souls, 1 Peter, ii. 25.

9. Jacob served long for his wives Rachel and Leah, Ibid.—So did Christ bear the shape of a servant thirty-three years and more, to redeem unto himself a Church of Jews and Gentiles, Isaiah, xlii.

10. Jacob being afraid of death by Esau, went alone all night to pray, Gen. xxxii. 22—32.—So Christ fearing death and wrath, went aside in Gethsemane to do so, Matt. xxvi. 39—45.

11. He wrestled long, and at last was comforted, ver. 28.—So did Christ in an agony, and at last was heard in that which he feared, Heb. v. 7.

12. Jacob purged his family in the way, Gen. xxxv. 2—4.—So doth Christ his Church in the world, 1 Cor. i. 30. John, xv. 2.

13. Jacob was the father of all the Israel in the flesh.—So Christ is the father of all the Israel in the spirit, Psal. xxii. 30.

14. Jacob was obedient unto his parents in all things, Gen. xxviii. 1—7.—So was Christ both to his heavenly Father, and his earthly parents, Luke, ii. 51.

15. Jacob erected an altar in Bethel, which by interpretation, is The House of God, Gen. xxxv. 6, 7.—So hath Christ established the true worship of his Father in his holy Church, John, iv. 21—26.

16. Jacob's days were but few and evil upon earth.—So was the estate of Christ on earth afflicted, and so shall be the estate of the Church unto the world's end, John, xvi. 33.

17. Jacob's flock was spotted or particoloured, Gen. xxx. 32.—So have the godly here their own spots, and are in part but sanctified, 1 John, iii.

THE DISPARITY.

Jacob's father loved his elder son better than him; but not so did the Father love any equally to his Son, even his only well-beloved Christ Jesus. Jacob attained to the birthright and blessing for himself, and that through subtilty; but Christ Jesus hath purchased that heavenly and blessed inheritance for us only, and that by paying therefor dearly. Jacob and Esau were at once both born of the womb of Rebecca; but Christ Jesus alone only was born of the womb of the inviolate chaste Virgin Mary, without an associate, either in his matchless birth, or eternity of age.

XI. *Jacob's Ladder*, Genesis, xxviii.

1. Jacob's ladder, which he saw in a vision, stood upon the earth, but the top reached to heaven; and so it joined as it were heaven and earth together, Gen. xxviii. 12.—So Christ, albeit he was humbled in shape of sinful flesh, touching the earth as it were, yet he was the most high God, reaching so to heaven, and reconciling, as the two natures in himself by personal union, so God and us together by his death and mediation, Rom. v. 10.

2. The angels went up and down by it.—So by Christ Jesus they are become ministering spirits, coming and returning for the good and protection of the godly, Heb. i. 7. 14.; as also by him our prayers ascend, and God's blessings descend.

3. No ascending up to heaven but by the ladder.—So no attaining to that inheritance but by Jesus Christ alone, Acts, iv. 12.

4. Jacob in his pilgrimage saw the ladder only in a vision.—So we see here Christ in our pilgrimage but in a glass, as it were, darkly and in part, 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

5. The Lord stood above it, and made his promise of Canaan to Jacob, ver. 13.—So in Christ, and through him, are the Lord's promises of heaven made and ratified to us, 2 Cor. i. 20.

6. In the place which was the house of God, and gate of heaven, was the ladder seen, ver. 19.—So in Christ's Church, (which is the foresaid truly,) through faith can we only get a spiritual sight of Christ.

7. At the foot of this ladder, Jacob did repose and sleep.—Shadowing the rest and peace of conscience which the godly have under the shadow of Christ's intercession.

THE DISPARITY.

It was a ladder whereon to climb, but not giving strength to that effect; but Christ Jesus, that blessed ladder, is both. That ladder, at Jacob's awaking, vanished, and begat fear by the vision thereof; but Christ Jesus, at our awaking in the resurrection, shall more clearly appear, whose sight by faith here expels fear, and begets confident joy, and whose clearer sight, then, shall beget far greater joy.

XII. *Joseph*, Genesis, xxx. 24.

1. Joseph, increasing or perfect.—So Christ increased in his human body in strength, and in favour with God and man, and still now increases in his mystical body also, and only he on earth was perfect.

2. Joseph was best beloved of his father, Gen. xxxvii. 3.—So was Christ declared to be that well-beloved Son, in whom the Father is well pleased, Matt. iii. 17.

3. Joseph was the first-born of beloved Rachel, Gen. xxx. 24.—So was Christ the first-born of the freely beloved Mary, Matt. i. 25.

4. He was hated of his brethren the more for his heavenly revelations and words, that he should be exalted above them, Gen. xxxvii. 4—8.—So was Christ of the Jews, and the more, because he called himself the Son of God, John, v. 18.

5. All the sheaves of the field, with sun, moon, and stars, worshipped Joseph, ver. 7.—So at the name of Jesus, all things in heaven and earth shall bow the knee, and him both heaven and earth must adore, Eph. i. 20. 1 Cor. xv. 24—28.; Phil. ii. 10, 11.

6. Joseph is sent by his father to visit his brethren in the wilderness, ver. 13.—So was Christ sent to visit mankind in the world, who were straying in sin, Matt. ix. 15.

7. Humbly walking on foot, and alone undergoing this message willingly, with great travel he ceases not till he have found them in Dothan, which is, defection, ver. 17.—So Christ Jesus, in the shape of a servant, willingly alone undertaking the office of a Saviour, seeketh out his brethren, the lost sheep of the Jews and Gentiles, and finds them both in defection of life and doctrine, 1 John, iv. 10. Matt. v. Rom. ii.

8. Yet Joseph comes near, his brethren conspire against him, and called him a dreamer, ver. 19.—So Christ was scarce born, when Herod conspired for his life, and scarce entered in his function, when the Scribes and Pharisees laid snares for him, and called him a seducer, John, viii.; Matt. ii. 3—18.

9. Joseph is stripped naked, and cast into a pit, and sold for twenty pieces of silver to the Idumeans by his own brethren, ver. 24—28.—So was Christ stripped of his garments, and cast into the pit of death and the grave, after he had been sold for thirty pieces of silver to the Scribes and Pharisees by one of his own disciples, Matt. xxvi. 47, and xxvii.

10. Joseph was carried down to Egypt in his childhood, ver. 28.—So was Christ Jesus in his infancy, Matt. ii. 13—15.

11. Joseph was tempted to carnal whoredom in solitariness, and overcame, Gen. xxxix. 12—15.—So was Christ unto spiritual in the wilderness, when Satan said, "Fall down and worship me," and overcame likewise, Matt. iv. 10.

12. Joseph was a beautiful personage, ver. 6.—So was Christ both inwardly and outwardly.

13. He was falsely accused, condemned, and put in prison, where Pharaoh's baker and butler were also put, ver. 20.—So was Christ accused falsely, condemned unjustly, and crucified cruelly between two malefactors, and put in the prison of the grave, where godly and wicked remain, till they come out to divers judgment, Matt. xxvii.

14. He was made governor over the prison, ver. 21—23.—So is Christ Lord and victor over death and the grave, Hosea, xiii. 14.

15. He comforted the butler in the prison, assuring him of life and preferment, Gen. xl. 13.—So did Christ the thief upon the cross bound with him; assuring him, that that night he should be with him in paradise, Luke, xxiii. 43.

16. Joseph being brought out of the prison, was exalted next unto Pharaoh the king, Gen. xli. 40.—So Christ having risen from the grave, was exalted next unto the Father, Psal. cx.

17. Joseph was declared to be one, like to whom none was in understanding and wisdom, in whom God's Spirit was so, ver. 38.—So was Christ matchless in wisdom, to whom God measured not his Spirit, John, iii. 34.

18 Joseph is set over the whole land, and over the king's house, ver. 40.—So is Christ Lord of the whole earth; but chiefly of his Church, Zech. xiv. 9.

19. Joseph's name is called Zapnath-paaneah, that is, the expounder of secrets, and in the Egyptian tongue, a saviour of the world, ver. 45.—So is Christ this truly, the manifester of heavenly mysteries, who hath the key of David, and the blessed Saviour of mankind, Matt. xiii. 10, 11.; Rev. iii. 7.

20. Joseph was richly attired in his preferment, ver. 42.—So is Christ, in that highest exaltation of his, with glory above all things, John, iii. 35.

21. A forerunner cried to the people to kneel down before Joseph, ver. 43.—So the Baptist cried to prepare the way before Jesus, Mark, i. 2—8.

22. A virgin was given in wife unto Joseph by the king, ver. 45.—So are the godly given to Jesus by his Father, to be his Church, 2 Cor. xi. 2.

23. Joseph was thirty years old when he was preferred by Pharaoh to his office, ver. 46.—So was Christ of that same age, when he entered on his calling, Luke, iii. 23.

24. Pharaoh then directed his people to Joseph, ver. 55.—So did the Father the godly to Christ, saying, Hear him, Matt. iii. 17.

25. Joseph, with Pharaoh's garner, feedeth all Egypt, and other nations, ver. 57.—So with the word of God, penned by his Spirit's inspiration, Christ feedeth Jew and Gentile, John, vi.

26. Joseph's brethren at last come for food, and reverence him, Gen. xlii.—So shall the Jews at last (albeit long lingering) come to the profession of Christ, and adore him, Zech. xii. 10.

27. He knows his brethren first, before they know him, ver. 8.—So doth Christ love us first, and find us out, before we can love, know, or find him, 1 John, iv. 19.

28. He spoke unto them long by mid-men, before clearly he revealed himself unto them, ver. 23.—So doth he speak to us by the ministry of the gospel here, before he manifest himself clearly unto our souls in glory hereafter; and manifested himself by obscure prophecies, before he uttered himself by his own lively voice, Heb. i. 1, 2.

29. Until Joseph told them that he was their brother, they did not know him, Gen. xlv. 4.

—So until Christ discover himself unto our souls, we cannot discern him, John, i. 5—10.

30. At first he was strange and rough unto them, to make them remember their fault; but, in the meanwhile, he gave them food without money, and afterwards comforted them, Gen. xlii. 7.—So, at the first, doth Christ, by touch of conscience, without feeling of assurance of mercy at an instant, humble us; but, in the meantime, he, in love, gives us secret grace freely, that we despair not, till we get the feeling of solid comfort, 2 Cor. i. 3.

31. Joseph accepteth of their small gifts, albeit he had no need of them, Gen. xliii. 15. —So doth our Saviour of our spiritual and charitable offerings, Phil. iv. 18.

32. They are washed in his house, and set at his table, ver. 31—33.—So are the true brethren of Christ made clean by the water of the Spirit, and feed at his table, Eph. v. 26.

33. No acceptation without Benjamin, Gen. xlii. 34, that was born with sorrow.—So no acceptation before God of us, but by faith and repentance, Eph. ii. 8.

34. He first manifesteth himself unto his brethren, before to the Egyptians, that he was Joseph, Gen. lv. iii.—So Christ revealed himself first unto the Jews that he was the Messiah, before he turned to the Gentiles, Matt. x. 5, 6.

35. It was not his brethren's malice so much, as God that sent him to Egypt, to save the family of Israel alive by a great deliverance, ver. 5.—So neither was it the malice of the Jews that crucified Christ, so much as the Lord's decree that it should be so, for the salvation of his Church, Rom. iii. 25.

36. Joseph recommends concord and love to his brethren in the way, seeing he forgave them, and gives them victuals and chariots for the journey, ver. 24.—So doth Christ recommend love amongst his members; and seeing he hath pardoned us, that we mutually forgive one another, and hath given us the means of his word and sacraments, to farther us in the way of our salvation, John, xv. 12—17.

37. They shew by word, and by his gifts unto their father, that Joseph was alive, ver. 27.—So should we, by our profession, and the graces of the Spirit shining in our lives, that Jesus is living in us, 2 Cor. v. 15.

38. The words of Joseph reported by his brethren were confirmed by the sight of the chariots unto Jacob.—So are the promises of Jesus, uttered by his ministers, ratified and sealed unto his people by the blessed sacraments, which are the chariots of grace to all true believers.

39. The Lord's promise of protection, the desire to see Joseph, and the hunger in the land, joined all together, moved Jacob the more quickly and gladly to remove, Gen. xlvi.—So God's promise of convoy by his angels, the desire to be with Christ, and the scarcity of goodness here, moves the godly more willingly to depart, Phil. i. 23.

40. Joseph went out and met his brethren, Gen. xlvi. 29.—So doth Jesus invite all those that come unto him, Luke, xv. 4—10. by his grace here, and angels hereafter.

41. Pharaoh and his court rejoiced at their coming, Gen. lxvii.—So doth the Lord and the angels of heaven rejoice at the conversion of sinners, Luke, xv. 8.

42. He goeth to Pharaoh, and speaketh for them, and instructeth them how to speak before Pharaoh, Gen. xlvi. 31—43.—So doth Christ intercede for us at the Father's hands, and instructeth us how to pray to him, Matt. vi. 6—13.; Rom. viii. 26, 27.

43. He placed them in pleasant Goshen there, while thence they should go to fruitful Canaan thereafter, Gen. xlvii. 11.—So Christ places his own in the estate of grace here, while they be transplanted into the estate of glory, and of his triumphant Church hereafter, John, xvii. 24.

44. Jacob's petition concerning Joseph when they met, was, Now let me die in peace, seeing I have seen thy face, Gen. xlvi. 30.—So was old Simeon's concerning Christ, Now let thy servant depart in peace, seeing I have seen the salvation of the Lord, Luke, ii. 29, 30.

45. Joseph brought his two sons to be blessed of his father, Gen. xlviii.—So hath Christ brought his chosen of the Jew and Gentile, a new way to be blessed of his Father, Heb. x. 20.

46. Jacob willeth that his name be named on Joseph's sons, and that they be accounted as his, Gen. xlviii. 5.—Even so hath the Lord adopted us to be his sons through Christ, and willed that his name likewise be called upon by us, saying, Abba Father, Rom. viii. 15.

47. Joseph buried his father solemnly, Gen. l.—So did Christ the shadowing types that went before him, perfectly, John, xix. 30.

48. While Joseph lived, Israel did not so increase.—So while Christ suffered, his Church did not so flourish, Euseb. Hist.

49. Israel was afflicted after Jacob's death, while at last the Lord delivered them.—So was the Church under the ten persecutions after Christ's death, till the Lord at last did settle the same in peace, Eusebius.

THE DISPARITY.

Joseph accused his brethren unto his father, and brought him their evil saying, Gen. xxxvii. 2. But Christ Jesus excuseth his brethren, covering their faults, and intercedeth for them.

XIII. *Moses.*

1. Moses, drawn or taken out.—So was Christ drawn out of the waters of many afflictions, to be consecrated our Saviour, and

taken out of the race of mankind, to be that blessed seed, Gen. iii. 15.

2. He was meanly born, Exod. ii. 1.—So was Christ of a pure virgin, Matt. i.; Luke, ii. 7.

3. He was immediately after his birth persecuted by the cruelty of Pharaoh, ver. 3.—Even so was Christ by the cruelty of Herod, Matt. ii.

4. His cradle was an ark daubed with slime and pitch.—So was Christ's first cradle an uncleanly crib, Luke, ii. 7.

5. He was wonderfully preserved by her whose son he was called, ver. 9.—So was Christ by Joseph, (being admonished in a dream,) whose son he was reputed, Matt. ii.

6. He left Pharaoh's court to be a deliverer of his people, and to suffer with them, ver. 15.—So did Christ the court of heaven, to deliver his chosen, and both to suffer for and with them, Isaiah, liii.

7. He was a shepherd, and his wife black, but fruitful, ver. 21.—So is Christ the shepherd of our souls, and his Church black, but comely, and fruitful in godliness, 1 Peter, ii. 25.; Cant. ii. 5.

8. Moses was sent to deliver Israel out of Pharaoh's bondage, Exod. iii. 10.—So is the Messiah, that was sent of God, to deliver his Church from Satan, sin, and damnation, 1 Cor. xv. 57.

9. He was meek above all men, Num. xii. 3; but wrathful at the erection of the golden calf, Exod. xxxii. 19—21.—So was Christ meekness itself, but full of zealous anger at the abusing of God's house, Mark, xi. 15—17.

10. He was faithful in all God's house, Heb. iii. 2.—So was Christ Jesus; but in a more excellent manner, as a Son, and not as a servant, Heb. iii. 3—6.

11. At his coming to deliver Israel, Pharaoh raged and oppressed them the more, Exod. v.—So did Satan and his instruments rage the more at the coming of Christ to redeem mankind; and still rageth the more that his kingdom is near an end, 1 Peter, v. 8.

12. The Egyptians disregarded his message, Exod. vii.—So did the wicked Scribes Christ's speeches; and still as yet the ungodly contemn his word, Matt. xxiii. 37—39.

13. Israel was baptized, in their delivery from Pharaoh, unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea, 1 Cor. x. 2.—Typifying how the Church of God in their delivery from Satan, sin, and death, by Christ Jesus, should be baptized unto him, and by him, in the red sea of his precious blood, 1 Cor. xii. 13.

14. Moses instituted the passover, and delivered Israel by his rod through the Red Sea, Exod. xii.—So did Christ the Lord's supper, and delivered his Church by his cross through his blood, Matt. xxvi. 26—29.; 1 John, i. 7.

15. He sweetened Marah unto the people, by the tree he did cast in, Exod. xv. 25.—So hath Christ our afflictions, by the cross that he did bear, Heb. ii. 10.

16. While he prayed with his hands up, Israel overcame their enemies, and, at his mediation, God's wrath was appeased, Num. xiv.; Exod. xvii. 10—16—So by the intercession of Christ, grace is given us to overcome our spiritual enemies, and God's wrath is altogether quenched, Heb. viii. 6.

17. The law was given by Moses, and exhibited by wonders, Exod. xx.—So is the gospel by Christ, and confirmed by miracles, John, i. 17.; Heb. ii. 3, 4.

18. Moses fasted forty days before he gave the law on Sinai, Exod. xxxiv. 28.—So did Christ fast so long in the wilderness before he began to preach the gospel in Judea, Matt. iv. 2.

19. God was more clearly manifested to him than any other in Israel, Exod. xxxiii. 11.—So was the Lord more clearly seen by Christ than by any creature, John, i. 18.

20. He was, in a sort, transfigured in face on Sinai, when he shined so before the people, that they could not behold him unvailed, Exod. xxxiv. 29—35.—So was Christ transfigured wholly on Tabor, when his body and garments shined to his disciples, that they were ravished, and wist not what they said, Matt. xvii. 2—8.

21. Many of the people were destroyed with Korah for offending against him, for murmuring and insurrection, Numb. xvi. 1—35.—So were many of the Jews by Titus, for trespassing so against our Saviour in crucifying him, Josephus's History.

22. He died willingly upon Mount Abarim, and left Joshua to supply his room, Deut. xxxiv. 5—12.—So did Christ upon Mount Golgotha, and having ascended, sent his Spirit to supply his room, Acts, ii.

23. His grave was never found; for he rose again, as is apparent by his apparition on Tabor with Elias talking with Christ, Deut. xxxiv. 6.; Matt. xvii. 3.—So likewise did Christ Jesus rise the third day, not being found of them that sought him in the grave, Matt. xxviii. 6.

24. He led Israel to Canaan, Deut. xxxii.—So doth Christ lead his Church to heaven, John, xiv. 6.

25. He was king, prophet, and mediator of the people.—Typifying so Christ Jesus in all these his offices, Heb. ix. 11.; 1 Tim. vi. 15.

26. He appointed the tabernacle and service thereof, as the Lord commanded him, and according to the pattern, Exod. xxv. 40.—So hath Christ appointed the worship of his Father, in the ministry and government of his Church, according to the word.

THE DISPARITY.

Moses was most unwilling to undergo that calling of deliverance of Israel; but Christ most willingly undertook the deliverance of his Church. Moses' hands also were wearied in holding up; therefore fell down, till Aaron and Hur staved them up; but the hands of our blessed Mediator are never weary to intercede for his people. Moses saw not God face to face; but he that proceedeth out of the bosom of the Father, did see him clearly, even Christ, who is the engraven character of the Father. Also, Moses led the people only into the sight of Canaan, and unto the borders thereof, but gave them not possession therein; but our Mediator and Messiah hath purchased the same unto his chosen, and hath gone before to prepare a place for us in that celestial Canaan, that we may possess the same peaceably after the day of our dissolution.

OF HOLY TIMES IN GENERAL.

As there were amongst the Jews, in that Levitical and typical law of theirs, holy persons, holy things, holy places, so were there holy times, which were either days, moons, seasons, or years, calling to memory special benefits, and thereby pointing to higher mysteries.

1. Days: The Sabbath, which was holy. —Which did call to mind the benefit of our creation, for which we should be thankful; and did therewith signify that eternal rest of God's chosen, which they should enjoy, Rev. xiv. 13.

2. Moons: Such was the new moon, which was holy.—Which did put in mind the Lord's government of all things, as from whom all alterations and changes do come; and therefore teaches us to rely on his providence, Psal. xxiii. 1.

3. Seasons: which were three.

1st, The Passover.—Typifying and teaching the benefit of our redemption, as shall be hereafter more fully declared. 2d, Pentecost. —Reminding us thereby to acknowledge the benefit of our sanctification by the Holy Ghost. 3d, The feast of Tabernacles, or Tents.—To make us mindful, (as well as the Jews,) of our protection: who are daily preserved as the Israelites were, in tents, in the wilderness.

4. Years: which was every seventh year: but especially that great jubilee after a sabbath of seven years.—To remind us of that full freedom and joy, in that great day of the glorifying of God's saints. So that being created, governed, redeemed, and preserved here; by the same God we shall be glorified hereafter.

The Passover, Exodus, xii.; 1 Cor. v. 7.

1. It was called the Passover; because the destroying angel passed over all their houses, whose door-posts were struck with the blood thereof, and wherein the same was eaten, Exod. xii. 23—27.—So is Christ called; because God's wrath passes over all them, whose souls are sprinkled with his blood, and truly by faith feed upon him, 1 Cor. v. 7.

2. It was killed before Israel was delivered, Exod. xii. 6.—So Christ behoved to suffer before we could be redeemed, Acts, xvii. 3.

3. It was killed before Moses' law, or Aaron's sacrifices were enjoined.—To shew, that by none of them, but by the true Passover, that Lamb of God, killed from the beginning, deliverance comes to mankind, Rom. iii. 19—26; Heb. ix. 12—14.

4. It was killed, and to be killed yearly the first month of the year, ver. 2, when the day lengthening, and the sun ascending, each thing beginneth to revive.—To shew, that by the true Passover, not only is our time and all other things sanctified; but also that we should in recent remembrance of that benefit of our redemption, all our days and years be thankful to our gracious Redeemer, Eph. i. 3; v. 4—20; and that by his death, true life and reviving came unto mankind.

5. It was slain the fourteenth day, which was the fourth day after the separation thereof, ver. 6, which was then full moon; shadowing, that then Christ should suffer, when the fulness of ceremonial light was in him accomplished, and in his death would make a full period to that which should ever after decay and vanish.—To shew, first, that after his birth, our Passover should not be sacrificed till the appointed hour; and, secondly, that as thereby they were taught to prepare themselves to the eating thereof, so should we to the eating of our Lamb by true faith and repentance, 1 Cor. xi. 28.

6. In the evening the passover was killed, ver. 6.—Shewing thereby, that, in the latter time, Christ should suffer; and as at night there is darkness, and all are at rest, so when all mankind were sitting in darkness of mind and life, and all the world at a general outward rest of peace, then should our Saviour come and suffer; as also the killing thereof at even did shew how, as at even the sun goes down, so it was the Sun of Righteousness that was to suffer and die, and at his passion what universal darkness should be upon the whole earth, Luke, xxiii. 44.

7. At night also the passover was eaten, ver. 8.—Prefiguring so unto us how our true paschal Lamb should be eaten by us, in *mysterio scilicet, accenso alio lumine quam naturali.*

8. It was eaten in Goshen, Israel being in Egypt; and in Jerusalem, they being in Canaan; both places of the Church's abode.—To shew that, in his true Church only, is our true Pastor to be found, and profitably fed upon, Col. i. 18.

9. It was, more particularly, eaten in the

family, each house a lamb, ver. 3.—Shewing, that, with unity in faith and love, as all of one family, we must eat of our true Passover; and that they are but few who truly feed, and are partakers of this Lamb, Matt. vii. 13.

10. The house must be prepared.—To warn us so to prepare our hearts, 1 Cor. xi. 28.

11. If the house be too little, the neighbours must be joined; yea, the stranger, if he be circumcised, ver. 4.—To signify, first, the superabundant virtue of Christ's death, for the house may be too little for the lamb, but not the lamb for a house; as likewise, the sweet communion of saints in love, the joyful vocation also of the neighbour Gentiles, and admission to the fellowship of faith, being inwardly circumcised, and at last to condemn the private giving of the sacraments to one or two only.

12. The passover was to be taken of the lambs, ver. 5.—To shew that our Saviour should be innocent in life, meek and patient in death, and profitable always, Isaiah, liii.

13. Or it was to be taken of the kids, *Ibid.* And in general, the taking of it from among the flock, did signify the separation of Christ from sinners.—To shew, although our Saviour was sinless himself, yet he should come of the race of sinners, as the kid comes of the goat; as also, that, in wrong reputation, and true imputation, being made sin for us, he should be as a kid or a goat, 2 Cor. v. 21; Isaiah, liii. 4.

14. It must be without any blemish, *Ibid.*—Shadowing thereby the perfection and innocency of Christ, Psalm xl. 7, 8.

15. He must be a male, *Ibid.*—Noting thereby the excellency of strength and dignity, most proper to that sex, which should be in Christ, Exod. xxiii. 17; 1 Cor. xi. 3.

16. He must be a year old, *Ibid.*—Signifying the experience that Christ should have of our miseries, whereof even a day's continuance yields sufficient proof; as also, that perfection of Christ in like sort, and that in fulness of time he should come and suffer; a year being a perfect revolution of the sun's full course, Heb. iv. 15; v. 2.

17. It must be set apart a while, ver. 6.—Teaching thereby preparation, and due meditation of the Lord's great work of our deliverance, 1 Cor. xi.; Psalm ciii.

18. It was then killed, and that by Israel, *Ibid.*—So Christ behoved to die before the comfort could flow to us of appeasing God's wrath, and satisfying his justice, the merit of whose death redounds to his chosen Church only, Isaiah, lix. 20.

19. The blood was besprinkled on the lintel and door-posts, that the angel seeing the same might pass by, ver. 7.—Signifying, that by Christ's blood applied, the wrath of God is made to pass by us: and where Christ the Lamb is inwardly in the house of the soul, the sprinkling of Christ's blood will be seen by sanctification outwardly in the practice of the life, 1 Cor. i. 30.

Note also, that the aspersion of this blood by hyssop (which is a purging herb) doth give us to understand the threefold virtue of Christ's blood. First, as it is a ransom to God's justice; and, secondly, preserveth from the destruction of God's wrath: so, thirdly, it purgeth also the polluted soul. — Also the sprinkling of the blood upon the door-posts, noted how, going in and out, we should ever remember Christ's death, and not be ashamed of the profession of his cross. And that by baptism our souls must first be sprinkled with his blood, before we can expect to be partakers truly of his body, 1 Cor. xii. 13.

20. The lamb must be roasted with fire, and that wholly, or all of it, ver. 8.—Signifying thereby the agony of Christ in the garden, and the wrath of his Father, which he did endure both in soul and body, Matt. xxvi. 36—44.

21. It must not be eaten raw, ver. 9.—Noting, that we should not unpreparedly receive, nor grossly conceive of Christ in the sacrament, John, vi. 52—63; 1 Cor. xi. 26—30.

22. It must not be sodden with water.—Shewing that to his institution we must not join our inventions (adding, altering, or impairing;) nor to the merit of his all-sufficient sacrifice, the proud merit of our imperfect righteousness, Isa. lvii. 12.

23. It must be all eaten, and that with unleavened bread, ver. 8.—To shew, that nothing in Christ is unprofitable or to be rejected, and that to the true participation of him, we must eschew corruption of doctrine, of manners, and malice, 2 Cor. v. 14, 15.

24. With bitter herbs also the passover must be eaten. — Signifying thereby, that with repentance we must eat our passover, in remembrance of the bitter estate of sin's slavery, wherein we were captivated, and of the bitter passion of Christ, whose teeth were set on edge when we had eaten the sour grapes, Isaiah, liii. 4—9.

25. They behoved to eat the passover, their loins being girded, their staves in their hands, and their shoes on their feet, ver. 11.—To shew how we should eat our passover, like pilgrims, to wit, not looking for a permanent city here: our loins girded with truth, and the preparation of the gospel on our feet, the staff of God's word in our hands, and with alacrity and readiness pressing forward to ou heavenly mansion, Phil. iii. 13; Heb. xi. 13, 14

26. They behoved likewise to eat the same in haste, as not doubting of the speedy work of their deliverance, and as ready waiters when they should be called out of doors.—To signify we should likewise in faith and readines come when Jesus calls, and with affection of fear and love, (which are the two usua

causes of haste,) desirously and boldly eat our passover, 1 Cor. xi.

27. Nothing was to be reserved of the lamb till the morrow, ver. 10.—Noting thereby the fulness of their and our deliverance, not that we should reserve our sin to live in a while, keeping up as it were a part of Christ's death for it. Popish reservation also of the host is condemned hereby.

28. If any remain thereof overnight, the same must be burnt with fire, ver. 10.—Teaching to avoid profanation of holy things thereby. *Hoc pacto etiam compellens accersere egenos*, saith a father. This burning is apishly imitated in the Popish host.

29. No uncircumcised person might eat of the passover.—So no unsanctified person can be a true partaker of Christ Jesus, Matt. xxii. 11—14.

30. The bones thereof might not be broken.—Typifying thereby in Christ's suffering, that not a bone of him should be broken, as was foretold, John, xix. 36.

31. None might go out of doors that night.—Perseverance in Christ's family or Church, and in the bosom thereof, being pointed at hereby, not going out in affection to the world again, Rev. ii. 10.

32. One law shall be for all, saith the Lord, ver. 49.—Shewing thereby how the Church of Christ is governed, and that with God there is no respect of persons, Acts, x. 34.

33. It was to be observed with the word of instruction, to be joined thereto, ver. 26, 27.—So is the sacrament to be celebrated with the word of institution, and exhortation to be added thereto likewise, as the seal and charter going together, 1 Cor. xi.

Lastly, The blood of the lamb was first sprinkled, and then itself prepared and eaten.—This shews that first Christ was made a sacrifice to God, and then a sacrament to us.

THE DISPARITY.

The Jewish passover did feed the body; but our passover, Christ, doth feed the soul. It was a sign of their deliverance; but Christ is the very worker of our deliverance. There were many lambs eaten in the whole camp, all called the passover; because they pointed at one alone who should be the true passover, and who alone sufficeth the whole number of his faithful. The lamb being eaten, nothing thereof did remain; but Christ being fed upon, is nothing impaired, but remaineth as perpetual nourishment to his own chosen.

XV. *Aaron.*

1. Aaron, a teacher, or the mountain of fortitude.—So is Christ the true teacher of his Church, and exalted mountain of invincible strength, Matt. v.

2. He was Moses' mouth to the people, Exod. iv. 15, 16.—So was Christ his Father's mouth to the world in declaring his will, John, i. 18.

3. He was the blesser of the people, Lev. ix. 22.—So is Christ the true blesser of his people and Church, Gen. xii. 3.

4. He was the high priest of the Lord, Lev. viii.—And so was Christ that only true high priest of his faithful, Heb. vii. 24—28.

5. He died on the top of Mount Hor, called Mosera, Num. xx. 28, 29.—So Christ died on the top of Mount Golgotha, Matt. xxvii. 33.

THE DISPARITY.

Aaron died in the wilderness for his own offence, for disobeying the Lord at the waters of Meribah; but Christ Jesus, our high priest, died in the world, for our offences and manifold disobedience imputed to him, and undertaken by him. Also, Aaron brought not the people into Canaan, neither entered there himself; but our High Priest hath both entered himself into that heavenly Canaan, and bringeth the members of his true Church there also.

The High Priest, Exodus, xxviii.

1. He was taken from among men, but behoved not to have any blemish, Lev. xxi. 17—24.—So was Christ of the race of mankind according to the flesh; but was altogether sinless, Heb. vii. 26.

2. He assumed not this honour to himself, but it was given him of God.—So neither did Christ, but it was given him of the Father, Heb. v. 5.

3. He was washed with water, and anointed with the holy oil, Exod. xxix. 7.; Lev. viii. 12.—To note that immaculate sanctity that should be in Christ, and that he should be anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows, Isaiah, lxi. 1.

4. His flesh and loins were covered with clean linen, Exod. xxviii. 42.—So was Christ's humanity clothed with true holiness, Isa. liii.

5. He was clothed gloriously, Exod. xxviii. 2.—So was Christ with perfect righteousness, and the majesty of his Deity.

6. He had a holy crown upon his head, Exod. xxix. 6.—Signifying thereby the Deity of Christ, (which as a circle hath neither beginning nor end,) and the royal dignity wherewith he is crowned king of his chosen, Jer. xxiii. 5, 6.

7. He had an engraven plate with "holiness unto the Lord," on his forehead, Exod. xxviii. 36.—Noting the intercessory oblation of the perfection of his holiness, whereby our imperfect righteousness is at the Father's hands accepted, Heb. ix. 14.

8. The colours of the embroidering of his garments being blue, purple, scarlet, and white, Exod. xxviii. 6.—Signified the truth

of his prophetical, the majesty of his royal, the perfection of his priestly offices, and his sincere sanctity in execution of all, with all his other resplendent graces beautifying his blessed person, Heb. x.; John, xvii.; Acts, vii.

9. The edge of woven work about the collar of the robe of the ephod, that it should not tear, ver. 32. — Typified the spiritual strength, and entire righteousness of Christ, Heb. vii. 26.

10. He had Urim and Thummim upon his breast, ver. 30.—So had Christ the perfection of true light, and perfect holiness in his heart, Heb. vii. 26.

11. He bore the names of the tribes of Israel upon his breast, when he went in before the Lord, ver. 29. — Typifying the continual intercession of Christ for his church, Heb. vii. 25.

12. These names were engraven in hard stones.—So are the godly not lightly written; but indelibly engraven in the memory and love of Christ, 1 John, iv. 10.

13. Likewise, he bore the names in two onyx stones upon his shoulders, Exod. xxviii. 9—12.—So doth Christ bear and upbear his own, by his secret power and grace, even when his back seems turned upon them, Isa. xlvi. 3, 4, interceding for them, Heb. vii. 25.

14. The wreathed chain tied to the rings of pure gold, wherewith the breast-plate and humeral was tied, ver. 14. — Signified the perfect connection of all heavenly virtues adorning Christ's humanity; as also, that true faith, whereby we are girt unto him, Eph. vi. 13—18.

15. The bells and pomegranates hanging about his vesture, whereby he was heard when he entered into the sanctuary and holiest place, ver. 33. — Shadowed his proclaiming of the joyful gospel, and confirming the same by his holy works and miracles upon earth; and also typified his continual intercession for his chosen in heaven, Heb. viii.

16. His costly wrought girdle, ver. 39.—Signified that truth and constancy whereby our High Priest, in his gracious promises of the gospel, is perfectly girt about.

17. He alone entered into the holiest place, and that not without blood, to make atonement and intercession for the people, Lev. xvi. —So hath Christ entered into the heavens, there, alone, and only, to be our mediator, through the merit of his precious blood shed, and atonement once made for all, to procure good things, and appease wrath for us, Heb. viii.

18. He might not go forth of the sanctuary to lament for the dead.—Shadowing, that Christ now being ascended and entered into the holy heavens, his beatitude now cannot be interrupted by any more sufferings of misery or grief, Heb. x.

19. His wife behoved to be a chaste virgin. —So must Christ's Church be as a virgin, chaste, and giving neither her love, nor his worship unto any other, 2 Cor. xi. 2.

20. The putting of the blood of the solemn sacrifice upon his right ear, thumb, and toe, Ex. xxix. 20.—Did shew, that, in Christ, there is nothing but what is right and unblameable, and that it is his blood that should make them blessed that should sit at his right hand, As also, the consecrating of Christ's whole person by his death and bloodshed to be the prince of our salvation, even as we should likewise, in all things, by his blood be consecrated unto his holy obedience in all our senses, actions, and walkings, Heb. vii. 27, 28.

21. His garments remained for ever, for his sons to be clothed therewith, Exod. xxix. 29.—Even so doth the garment of the righteousness of Christ abide for ever wherewith to clothe his own children, in justification, unto sanctification and glory, Isaiah, lxi. 10.

As for the linen garments of the inferior priests, they signified that holiness with which the ministry ought to be clothed, as set down by the apostle. 1 Tim. iii.

THE DISPARITY, Hebrews, vii.

The Jewish high priest was taken out of the tribe of Levi; but our High Priest is sprung from the tribe of Judah, not after the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchisedeck. Wherefore the priesthood being thus changed, of necessity there behoved to be a change of the covenant. Again, the Jewish high priest was made without an oath. Forasmuch, then, as Christ is not made without an oath, by so much is he made surety of a better covenant. Theirs was made after the law of the carnal commandment; but our High Priest is made after the power of an endless life. Theirs needed a successor; therefore they were many, because they were mortal; but ours, because he endureth for ever, hath a priesthood which cannot pass from one to another. Theirs behoved to offer up sacrifice for his own sins; but our High Priest is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, without spot. Theirs did frequently offer up sacrifice of beasts, whose blood could not cleanse; but our High Priest hath once offered up an all-sufficient sacrifice, never to be renewed, even himself, to the Father, whose blood cleanseth us from all our sins. Theirs every year entered into the holiest by the blood of bulls and calves, which could not take away sins; but our High Priest, by his own blood, hath once entered into the holy place, and obtained eternal redemption for us by the vail of his flesh, piercing the highest heavens, to appear in the sight of God for his Church, Heb. ix. 12.

XVII. *The Cloudy Pillar*, Exodus, xiv.

1. The cloudy pillar was Israel's guide, which they followed in their several encampments from Egypt to Canaan, Num. ix. 15, 16, 17, &c. —So is Christ our true guide, whom we must follow in our journey to heaven, both in the precepts of his word, and practice of his life, John, viii. 12.

2. It was in the shape of a pillar.—So is Christ like a pillar, firm, stable, and straight, and with his strength supporting all those that rely upon him, Exod. xv. 2.

3. In going behind between the camps of Israel and the Egyptians, it was a defence unto them, Exod. xiv. 19.—So is Christ not only a director, but a protector to his Church, from all their enemies, Psal. xviii. 1, 2.

4. It was darkness to the Egyptians, but gave light unto them of Israel, ver. 20.—So is Christ salvation to the godly; but a stumbling-block, and stone of offence unto the wicked, 1 Peter, vi. 8.

5. It was a cloud by day, and a fire by night to Israel, Ex. xiii. 21, 22.—So is Christ a cooling refreshment to his own, in the scorching day of temptation or trouble; and a comfortable lamp of light to direct them in the time of this life, Psalm cxix. 105; John, i. 4.

6. It was a fire and a cloud, yet both but one pillar.—So Christ is God and man likewise, yet in both but one person, Isa. ix. 6; Col. ii. 9.

7. It was a fiery pillar.—So is Christ not only strong as a pillar for the defence and bearing up of his own, and as a fire illuminating, purging, comforting, and kindling zeal in his chosen ones; but also he is a fire, fearfully to consume his enemies, as stubble before the flame, Psal. ii. 9—12.

8. In the fire, and in the cloud, God was seen by Israel in the wilderness; but both ceased in Canaan.—So in the word and in the sacrament he is seen by his Church in the world; but both shall cease in heaven.

THE DISPARITY.

The cloud vanished, and was no more seen, after they came to Canaan; but our blessed pillar Christ Jesus, when we enter, and come to that celestial Canaan, shall then more clearly and constantly be seen than before, the above mentioned typical representation of him in his word and sacraments having ceased, 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

XVIII. *The Rock*, Exodus, xvii.

1. It was a rock fixed and sure.—So is Christ that sure rock and foundation, upon which the godly build, and against which the blind wicked ones dashing, bruise themselves in pieces. To which also his own do run, as to a strong defence, and against which the gates of hell itself shall in no wise prevail, Matt. xvi. 18.

2. It had no outward delightful show in the wilderness, being barren and unseemly.—So neither had Christ any outward form or beauty in the world, that we should desire him; but as a root out of a dry ground, a man full of sorrows, and in hard distress and poverty, Isa. liii. 2, 3.

3. It seemed wonderful, and almost incredible even unto Moses, that God would cause the rock to give water to such a murmuring people.—So likewise was it a wonderful work of love, that the Lord should make his own Son to shed his blood for such rebels as mankind: wherefore Isaiah (liii. 1,) cries out, "Who hath believed our report?"

4. It gave water abundantly unto the people, when they could get none to quench their thirst; so that, in respect of its running streams, it is said to have followed them, 1 Cor. x. 4; and this water only sufficiently refreshed them all.—So Christ shed his blood abundantly when nothing else could redeem us, nor quench the torments of an accusing or grieved conscience; and this blood only is sufficient to purge all our sins, Heb. ix. 11—28.

5. It was first stricken with Moses' rod, before it gave forth the waters for the people, Exod. xvii. 6.—So was Christ nailed on the cross, according to that, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree:" our trangressions of the law being laid upon him, before his precious blood issued forth from his heart and wounds, to consummate the redemption of his Church, Luke, xxiii.

6. Moses, at that time, debarred himself from Canaan, and led the people only unto the borders thereof, delivering them to Joshua. —To shew, that Christ having suffered, by the law there is no justification, nor attaining unto heaven; but being imperfect and weak in itself, is now but the schoolmaster unto Christ Jesus, Rom. iii. 20; Gal. iii. 24.

THE DISPARITY.

All Israel promiscuously drank of the rock, as well the murmurers as the godly and patient; but so shall not all in the visible Church be partakers of the blood of Christ, but they only who truly repent and believe, Acts, iii. 19.

XIX. *Manna*, Exodus, xvi.; John, vi.

1. The Lord gave the people manna to satisfy their hunger, to testify his bounty, power, and providence, to tempt or try them in the wilderness, Exod. xvi. 4.—So the Lord sent Christ into the world to be made meet food for the hunger of our souls, to shew us likewise his unmerited mercy and kindness; and poor and lowly he sent him, to try who, notwithstanding, would believe in him, Isaiah, liii.

2. Manna was little in quantity, ver. 14.—

So was Christ little and contemptible in the eyes of the world, Isa. liii. 2.

3. It was white of colour, ver. 31.—So was Christ holy and sanctified in nature, Psalm xl. 7—8.

4. It was round in shape.—To note the perfection and entireness of Christ in all heavenly graces, Heb. vii. 26.

5. It was sweet, and tasted like fresh oil, or wafers baked with honey, Num. xi. 8.—So is Christ most sweet and pleasant in all afflicted consciences, by the recent and cheering consolation of his bloodshed and Spirit, John, xvi. 1—7.

6. It came down from heaven, John, vi. 32. —So did Christ Jesus, John, vi. 51.

7. The name thereof was "manah," or manhu; "what is this?" or, it is a portion, an admirable gift, or meat prepared, Exod. xvi. 15.—So is Christ the portion of his chosen, the admirable great gift of the Father, and prepared food for every hungering soul, John, vi. 51.

8. It came down with the dew, and was gathered, ver. 14.—So Christ comes to us with the dew of grace, and thereby is applied.

9. It fell round about the camp of Israel, and was sufficient for all to gather thereof, and fell in no other place, ver. 13.—So Christ is conversant within the limits of his Church, and is the fulness of grace to all who are true partakers of him, and nowhere else to be found, Eph. iii. 17—19.

10. It was gathered by measure in the wilderness, and he who gathered least had no lack, ver. 18.—So is Christ's grace in this world given but by measure, and he who hath the weakest faith, so it be true, shall attain to the same* salvation which he of a stronger doth, Luke, xvii. 6.

11. When it came, it made the people to admire, for they wist not what it was, ver. 15. —So when Christ came, many did wonder; yea, Herod and all Jerusalem with him, were troubled, and sundry wist not what the mystery of his incarnation meant, Matt. ii.; 1 Tim. iii. 16.

12. As it was sufficient for all, so it was common to all, and that freely.—So is Christ a free imparter of salvation to rich and poor, king and beggar, without respect of persons, Acts, x. 34, 35.

13. It was ground and baked before it was food meet for the people, ver. 23.—So Christ behoved first diverse ways to suffer, before he could be a meet comforter and saviour to his Church, Acts, xvii. 2—3.

14. It was gathered carefully, ver. 21.—So is Christ and his grace to be embraced speedily and timeously, Matt. xxv. 1—13; 2 Cor. vi. 2.

15. It was daily gathered except on the Sabbath, ver. 16.—So for a farther degree of grace, daily we must labour here, until that eternal Sabbath of rest come, when grace shall be perfected in glory hereafter, Phil. iii. 13, 14; 2 Peter, iii. 18.

16. They went out of their tents to gather it.—So must we go out of the old man and love of the world, to participate in Christ, Eph. iv. 17—24.

17. To the breakers of God's command, in keeping the same over-night, it turned into putrefaction to them, and stank, Ex. xvi. 20. —So to the hearers of Christ's word, and contrary practisers to the same, it becomes the savour of death, James, i. 22—25.

18. It ceased when they came to Canaan, Josh. v. 12.—So shall the word and sacraments when we come to the kingdom of heaven, and see Christ face to face, 1 Cor. xiii. 10—13.

19. Manna was kept and put in a golden pot before the Lord, to remain in the holiest for ever, Exod. xvi. 32—34.—So Christ Jesus, glorified in his humanity, at the right hand of God in the heavens, abides for ever unto all ages of the faithful, Heb. vii. 28.

20. Manna was loathed by the wicked murmurers, on whom the Lord's wrath fell, Num. xi. 6.—So is Christ Jesus in his word and sacraments, by the carnal and ungodly, whom God in his anger shall likewise destroy, Jude, 4.

21. Manna fed the natural life.—So doth Christ Jesus the spiritual life.

THE DISPARITY.

Manna did feed only the natural life; but Christ Jesus is the food of the spiritual life. Again, manna did corrupt and putrefy; but so cannot our spiritual manna, which abideth for ever a solid and sweet consolation to every distressed conscience. They enjoyed it only in the wilderness; but the chief and fullest enjoyment of our manna shall be in a celestial Canaan. It was not to be found but at a set time, for it melted away when the sun arose; but our manna, Christ, is at all times to be found, both in prosperity and affliction, late and early, never disappointing those that truly seek him. Manna that was reserved in the holiest, was spoiled and did perish thereafter at the captivity; but our heavenly Manna, seated in highest glory, can never perish nor suffer violence.

XX. *The Brazen Serpent*, Numbers, xxi.

1. Neither Moses nor the law could cure the people of the stinging of the fiery serpents, but only the brazen serpent. — So neither the law, nor any creature, could cure mankind, and redeem them from the power of Satan, but only Christ Jesus, Rom. iii. 25.

2. After many had died for murmuring, then the brazen serpent was set up, Num. xxi. 6, 8, 9.—So after that all mankind through sin

---

* Not to the same degree of glory in heaven, but he shall with no less certainty obtain the salvation of his soul.

were subdued to death and condemnation, Christ came for our recovery to be crucified, Isaiah, liii.

3. A serpent stung, and a serpent cured.—So man, the first Adam, lost mankind; and man again, the second Adam, redeemed mankind, Rom. v. 15—19.

4. Although it was called a serpent, yet it was both without poison or sting.—So although Christ was thought a sinner like other men, yet was he both sinless and spotless, Heb. vii. 26.

5. It was made of brass and not of gold, ver. 9.—So was Christ sent not with outward glory, or worldly pompous show, but base and humble in outward appearance, Isaiah, liii. 2.

6. It was not forged by man's hand or hammer, but in a mould, yet in the fire.—So Christ was not begotten by man, but conceived by the Holy Ghost in the likeness of the Father, Luke, i. 35.

7. It was not only made, but before it cured it was set up on high.—So Christ behoved not only to be born, but also to be crucified before our redemption could be finished.

8. They were only cured who looked upon the same.—So they only are redeemed from death to eternal life who, by faith, contemplate him, Isaiah, xlv. 22; Heb. xii. 2, believing in Christ, and him crucified.

9. It was a wonderful mean of cure, and undeservedly devised of God in mercy; yea, against the merit of these murmurers.—So is the death of the only Son of God for rebellious mankind an admirable work of unmerited mercy likewise, above our merit, without our merit, and against our merit, Eph. i. 4—10; Titus, iii. 5.

10. Yet although it was instituted by God, and great miracles wrought at the presence thereof, while the Lord's institution lasted, and right use was made of it by the people in the wilderness; at last, being idolatrously abused, it was destroyed by that godly king, Hezekiah, and called Nehushtan, or a mass of brass, 2 Kings, xviii. 4.—Shewing thereby, how lawfully, by like example, and much more likewise, images, and other inventions of men, turning to an idolatrous or superstitious abuse, might be abrogated in reformed Christian churches.

THE DISPARITY.

The brazen serpent was destroyed, as is said; but our exalted Jesus can never be destroyed. It retained not always the virtue of curing; but our blessed Saviour doth ever retain the virtue and efficacy of saving.

XXI. *The Tabernacle*, Exodus, xxvi.

It had three places in it, the outward court wherein the brazen laver and brazen altar stood.—Representing the visible Church, wherein are outward baptism, and the exercise of external worship common to all the called and elect, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

Secondly, The holy place, wherein was the candlestick, the table of shewbread, and the altar of perfume.—Representing the invisible true Church, consisting of the elect only, militant on earth, wherein is the light of the Spirit by the word, the true participation of Christ the bread of life, and the sincere acceptable sacrifice of true prayer and praise. Within this place enters only the royal priesthood of God, Rom. xii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 5.

Thirdly, The holiest of all, wherein was the mercy-seat, the glory of God between the cherubim, and the golden censer.—Representing the triumphant Church in the heavens, wherein is seated Christ Jesus in glory, the society of the blessed angels, and the praise of the glorified spirits, with the continual intercession of our Saviour for his saints on earth, Heb. viii.

2. The entrance to the holiest was by the holy place, and to the holy place was by the outer court.—So our entrance to the heavens is by being members of the invisible Church through faith in a good conscience; and our entrance to the membership of the invisible Church is by associating ourselves to the visible Church, professing the word and sacraments in the primitive apostolic sincerity.

3. The fixed pillars of the holy place.—Signifieth the apostolic doctrines, in respect of the ministry whereof, the Church itself is called the pillar of truth, 1 Tim. iii. 15.

4. The diverse ornaments and instruments thereof.—Typifieth the diversity of spiritual gifts and functions in the Christian Church, Rom. xii. 6.

5. The several coverings thereof.—Doth indicate the Lord's sure protection of his Church by his power and angels, Heb. i. 14.

6. Gold within and skins without.—Shadoweth the spiritual and inward glory of the Church, and her estimation with God, although contemptible to the world outwardly, Cant. iv.

7. The tabernacle and all the instruments thereof; yea, the very ash-pans and snuffers of the candlestick, must be made according to the pattern in the mount, Exod. xxv. 40; Heb. viii. 5.—Shewing thereby that the Church, and all the exercise of worship that is therein, whether doctrine or discipline, must be conformed unto the written word, Gal. i. 8, 9.

8. The voluntary oblation of the people to build the tabernacle.—Represents that willing allotment and portion that Christians should give for the upholding of God's worship and ministry among them, and for the maintenance of the poor members of Christ's mystical body, 2 Cor. ix. 6—12.

9. The principal builders of the tabernacle, were Bezaleel and Aholiab, extraordinarily endued with cunning in every work; and the secondary, were all skilful workmen, in whose minds God had put skill, and will to assist in the work, Exod. xxxvi.—Those representing the apostles, as master builders laying the foundation of the Christian Church; and the rest the ordinary pastors, building on their foundation aright, being gifted and fitted for that purpose, 1 Cor. iii. 10; Rom. xii. 6; Eph. ii. 20.

10. The parts of the tabernacle were so made, that they might be joined or separated when they wished, Deut. xii. 9.—To shew the faithful, in this tabernacle of their body, which is to be laid down, and raised again, to be far from their resting place, until they be in that glorious temple of the heavens settled and seated with Christ, 2 Cor. v. 4.

11. The curtains of the tabernacle embroidered with cherubims.—Signified the service and protection of the Church by the holy angels, Isa. vi.

12. These curtains were coupled by their strings and golden hooks, that it might be one tabernacle, Exod. xxvi. 6.—Shewing, that the diverse members of the Church, whether triumphant or militant, and everywhere dispersed, make up but one tabernacle, Eph. iv. 4; 1 Cor. xii. 12—20.

13. The glorious door of the tabernacle.—Shadowed Christ Jesus, who saith of himself expressly, I am the door, John, x. 7, by whom we get entrance either to grace or glory.

14. The tabernacle thus, by all the couplings thereof, being erected.—Did signify the compact connection, by every joint, of the whole body of the Church, in Christ the head by the truth in charity, for the nourishment of which (according to the effectual power which is in the measure of every part) it receiveth increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in love, Eph. iv. 16.

15. Every board of the tabernacle, signified each particular member of Christ and his Church; of shittim wood, that is, chosen and sanctified; overlaid with gold, that is, made glorious in Christ; standing upright, by the erection of hope, fixed by the tenons of faith, and founded on the socket Christ, as also joined by bars, which is the unity of one Spirit, and love: the covering of this tabernacle is Christ; the linen represents his innocency; the goat's hair, his afflictions (the penitent's garment being usually made of such;) the third covering dyed red, figuring his blood, covering our sins; and the fourth of badger's skins, his abasement and humility. The door of the tabernacle was not of any hard or debarring matter, but of a veil, easily penetrable, to shew our easy access to grace in Christ, and acceptance in the bosom of his Church.

XXII. *The Veil of the Holiest*, Exod. xxvi. 31

1. It was glorious, of embroidered work of diverse colours.—So was the body of Christ beautified with excellent, diverse, and heavenly graces, Heb. vii. 26.; Col. ii. 3.

2. It was replenished, and wrought full of cherubims.—Noting thereby that serviceable and ready attendance of the angels on the person and body of Christ, John, i. 51.

3. It was borne up by glorious and costly pillars, overlaid with gold on sockets of silver, which it covered, and whereon it did hang.—To shew that the humanity of Christ (specially in his suffering) should be borne up by his Deity, which his manhood did overvail, and under which it again in a manner did lurk.

4. By the veil only there was entrance into the holiest of all.—So by the veil of his flesh only (rent upon the cross) hath Christ made a new and living way for us, to God, and to heaven, Heb. x. 20.

XXIII. *The Ark*, Exodus, xxv. 10—17.

1. The ark was made of shittim-wood, which was durable, and not subject to putrefaction.—So Christ Jesus was neither subject to the corruption of sin, nor putrefaction of the grave, Psalm xvi. 9, 10; Acts, xiii. 37.

2. The wood was overlaid within and without with fine gold and pure.—So the excellent divine nature of Christ was so united to his human, that not only the virtue thereof glanced inwardly in his soul and mind, but outwardly also did shine most gloriously in his actions, Col. ii. 3—9; John, i. 14.

3. It had a crown of gold round about.—Signifying thereby the majesty of Christ's kingdom, or eternity of his Deity, which, as a circle, hath neither beginning nor end, John, i. 1; Heb. i. 8—12.

4. It had length, breadth, and height, and was in shape-four square.—Shadowing the patience and long-suffering of Christ, the ample extent of his love and grace, and the sublimity of his glory and reward, stable in himself, who could not be overthrown, and constant in mercy, who never can vary, Psalm ciii.

5. The measure of the ark exceeded not the dimensions of man's proportion, so that he might fathom it about.—Shewing thereby how Christ being made man, humbled himself to our capacity, was seen, heard, and handled, and remains still accessible, Heb. iv. 16.

6. It had four rings and bars whereby it was carried.—Signifying how Christ should be carried in the ministry of the gospel by his faithful preachers to the four corners of the earth, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

7. The bars in the rings must never be

severed from the ark.—So preaching and Christ must never be asunder, but, adhering to the ark and ground-stone, truth must be taught, Gal. i. 8.

8. The two tables were in the ark.—Signifying thereby, that Christ is the end of the law, satisfying the same for us, delivering us from the curse thereof, and making our obedience also to the law acceptable to the Father, by covering the imperfection of our works, Rom. x. 4; Gal. iii. 13.

9. In it was the pot of manna.—To shew, that, in Christ, is the treasure of comfort, spiritual nourishment, and life, Rev. ii. 17; Col. iii. 1.

10. In it also was Aaron's rod that budded, and bare fruit.—To signify, that, in Christ, we have assurance of a blessed resurrection, and that by him our rebellion is covered; as also, that in him Aaron's priesthood is wrapped up, and ceases, Heb. viii.

11. God spake by oracle out of the ark.—To prefigure, that, out of the nature of man in Christ, he should speak to the world, Heb. i. 1, 2.

12. The ark was an assurance of God's presence among the people, and God did dwell therein.—So Christ is the cause and assurance that God, in mercy, is present with us, John, xvii. 21, and in Christ personally the Deity did dwell.

13. Where the ark was, there only it was lawful to offer sacrifice, and no where else was it accepted.—To shew, that where Christ is—to wit, in the Church—there, and through him only, our service is acceptable, Eph. ii. 18.

14. By the ark Jordan was divided, so that the people went dry and safe over to Canaan.—So by Christ a ready way is made through all the horrors of death, for us to come safely to our heavenly kingdom, Psal. xxiii. 4.

15. The people might not come near unto the ark.—Shewing thereby what reverence ought to be to Christ in his word and sacraments, 1 Cor. xi. 28, 29.

16. By the ark's compassing of Jericho, with the blowing of the horns, the walls of the city fell down, and by the presence thereof in battle, the people were assured of victory.—So where Christ comes by the powerful preaching of his word, principalities and highest powers must yield, and if he be with us, who can prevail against us? Rom. viii. 31—39.

17. When the ark was set up in the temple of Dagon, Dagon fell and brake.—So where Christ comes by his gospel of truth, idolatry goeth down, Acts, xix.

18. The Philistines were plagued at the presence of the ark with them; but Obed Edom was blessed by having it with him.—So where Christ is in wrath, their estate is dangerous: but where he is in love, there blessings are with him, John, xvii.

19. The people of Bethshemesh were fearfully punished for looking into the ark.—To teach us how dangerous it is to pry into God's secrets unrevealed, and not to be wise according to sobriety, Rom. xii. 3.

20. After long transporting, at last it was gloriously conveyed, and settled in Solomon's temple, there to remain.—So after many journeys, and long-suffering on earth, Christ Jesus at last was received up in glory, into the holiest heavens, to sit at the Father's right hand for ever, Psal. cx. 1.

XXIV. *The Ark as it typified the Mystical Body of Christ.*

1. It was the keeper of the testimony.—So is the Church the keeper of the Scriptures.

2. It was wooden, but covered with pure gold.—So the Church is in itself infirm, but through Christ is strengthened and beautified with grace, Cant. i. 4.

3. God was present with the ark.—So is he with his Church, until the world's end, Matt. xxviii. 20.

4. The propitiatory covered the ark.—So doth Christ's death cover the spots of his Church, and the accusing of the law, Gal. iii. 13.

5. The cherubims stood above the ark.—So the protection of the angels stands above and about the Church, Heb. i. 14.

6. It was constantly conveyed from place to place, until it was at length stationed in the glorious temple of Solomon.—So the Church hath no constant place on earth, until it be at last settled in the glorious heaven, Heb. xiii. 14; 2 Cor. v. 1.

7. It had a crown of gold about it.—So is the Church crowned with diverse graces and gifts here, and shall be with the crown of glory hereafter, 1 Cor. xii.

8. It had the four dimensions proportionably.—So hath the Church of Christ the depth of faith, the height of hope, the latitude of charity, and the longitude of perseverance.

9. In it was the pot of manna and Aaron's rod.—So in Christ's Church is the comfort of true doctrine, and rule of wholesome discipline, Rev. xi. 5; 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

XXV. *The Mercy-Seat, or Propitiatory,* Exodus, xxv. 17—23.

1. It was called the mercy-seat, or propitiatory.—So is Christ he in whom mercy is truly seated, and hath made a propitiation for our sins, Rom. iii. 25.

2. It was the cover of the ark, where the two tables lay of the law of Moses.—So Christ is the true cover and deliverer of us from the curse and accusation of the law, Gal. iii. 13.

3. It was of pure gold.—Noting thereby the spotless holiness of Christ, Heb. vi. 26.

4. Upon it were two cherubims, shewing

that the very angels have their establishment in Christ their mediator, by confirmation; as also signifying the angels' ready attendance on Christ and his Church; as also figured, that when we draw near to the mercy-seat, Christ, being adopted and ingrafted in him, then are we joined to the society of the angels, Heb. xii. 22—25.

5. They stretched their wings on high, so covering the mercy-seat.—Figuring so the majesty of Christ's deity, which none even of the angels in glory can behold, but with their faces covered; and shadowing forth likewise hereby the most comfortable and sure protection of the Church, Micah, iv. 1—11, and their readiness to act Christ's will.

6. They looked down upon the mercy-seat. —Signifying the mystical majesty of the incarnation, into the which the angels desired to pry and behold, 1 Pet. i. 12.

7. The faces of the cherubims were one towards another, and both towards the mercy-seat.—So representing also the consent of the Old and New Testament, and their mutual witness-bearing one to another, and both looking upon Christ, the one pointing him to come, and the other already come: as also, signifying the holy love and agreement that the angels have among themselves in Christ.

8. From the mercy-seat, between the cherubims, the Lord uttered his will to the people, and did no more speak in a bush, or in a cloud. — So in diverse manners did the Lord speak in old time to the fathers, by dreams and visions; but now in the last days hath he spoken by his Son, and still doth in the two Testaments of his sacred word, Heb. i. 1, 2.

9. The cherubims were of gold, beaten out with the hammer. — Signifying the glistering brightness of heavenly wisdom contained in the Scriptures, whose worth is above gold, and is given by the inspiration of the Spirit of God, and penned by holy men, Psal. xix. 10; cxix. 72, 127; 2 Tim. iii. 16.

10. Note last of all, that not between seraphims, (which are put for executors of justice, as Isaiah, vi.) but between cherubims, as messengers of mercy, the Lord in Christ shews himself appeased.

XXVI. *The Golden Censer*, Hebrews, ix. 4.

With this golden censer the high priest, putting incense therein, filled the holiest place with a sweet perfume when he entered in to speak before the Lord.—Signifying thereby the Lord Jesus his intercession through the pure and perfect merit of his savoury obedience, wherewith he hath filled the holiest heavens, as with a sweet odour and incense, appeasing God's wrath, and making us and our prayers and works acceptable, Heb. iv. 14; vii. 25.

XXVII. *The Table of Shew-Bread*, Exodus, xxv. 23—31.

1. It was of shittim-wood, covered over with gold, and a crown about it.—Noting, as is said, the purity of Christ's humanity, with the glory of his Deity, and majesty of his kingdom.

2. It had food thereon, whereof only the priests might eat. — Signifying that spiritual and heavenly nourishment in Christ, whereof only the royal priesthood of the faithful are partakers.

3. The shew-bread was ever upon this table. —So true preaching, and the sincere administration of the sacraments (whereby that bread of life is set before us) must ever be upon Christ crucified, as on the sure ground, Gal. i. 8; 1 Cor. iii. 10, 11.

4. The incense cups were upon the table. — Signifying, that with the preaching of the word, and administration of the sacraments, prayer must be joined, and on Christ's institution and rule, as on the table, to be set and grounded, 1 Cor. xi. 23—29.

5. The bread was renewed often, and set before the Lord. — Teaching us that due acknowledgment and thankfulness which we should have, and renew frequently, for the benefits of the Lord, which he reneweth evening and morning towards us; as also typifying that variety of doctrine and comfort contained in Christ's word, and wherewith, as with old store and new, every skilful pastor should be furnished, to dispense in due time, 2 Tim. iii. 17.

6. The several instruments thereof; as dishes, goblets, and covers, were all of pure gold. — Figuring the diversity of gifts, places, and functions, in Christ's Church, wherein every one ought sincerely and holily to walk, 1 Cor. xii.

7. The bread in number were twelve, for the twelve tribes of Israel.—Signifying sufficient food to be in Christ's Church, and in the Scriptures, proponed for all the members of that spiritual Israel, and elect, to participate.

XXVIII. *The Candlestick*, Exod. xxv. 31—40.

1. It was the only thing that gave light unto the sanctuary. — So Christ is that only light, and light-giver, which shineth in his Church, John, i. 9.

2. It was of pure gold. — Shadowing so the excellency of Christ, and of his pastors, through that light whereof they are bearers, Rev. i.; and noting thereby also the dignity of the word, Psal. cxix.

3. It had seven lamps. — Signifying so the perfection of the light of Christ, seven being the number of perfection.

4. It was placed in the sanctuary. — So is the light of Christ placed in his Church, and

there only to be seen in the brightness of his word, and illumination of his Spirit. So that where that light shines not, there is not the true Church, John, viii. 12; 1 John, iv. 1—7.

5. It had an upright stem, which did bear the many branches that did issue and proceed from the same.—Typifying Christ Jesus, that true stalk and fountain of light, from whom all light floweth, and who bears up, and keeps constant in the truth, all the branches, and true light-bearers of his word, Rev. i. 20.

6. The branches were adorned with their bowls, knops, and flowers.—So are the true light-bearers of Christ adorned with diverse meet graces and gifts by him, tending both to the spiritual delight and profit of his Church, 1 Cor. xii. 8—11.

7. Aaron did dress those lamps, and renew their oil daily.—So is our blessed High Priest the only enlightener and fitter of his pastors, to shine the more clearly in his Church, and the pourer in of grace into their hearts, to be as lamps to others, by true faith in a good conscience, *Ibid.*

8. It had snuffers and snuff-dishes of pure gold.—Shewing how, with doctrine, should ever be joined the sincerity of discipline, according to God's word, whereby the light of the Church is kept clear; and how excommunication should be made of all scandalous and rebellious persons, like the extinguishing of noisome smelling snuffs. As likewise, that every one ought to content himself with his room, how low soever it be, if only in the sanctuary; and as the snuffers were of gold, so they ought conscientiously to walk in their station, Rom. xvi. 17, 18; 1 Cor. v. 9—13.

9. It was in the holy place, but not in the holiest.—Shewing how the light of God's word must be in the militant Church, but shall not need to be in the triumphant, when face to face we shall see the Lord in glory, Rev. xxi. 22, 23.

10. Also, as the candlestick had flowers, signifying the spiritual delectation of the word; so the knops of almonds which it had, did represent the efficacy of the word, unto the bringing forth of the fruits of holiness, Rom. xv. 4.

Last, the pure oil poured into the lamps, making the same to burn,—signified the grace of the Spirit accompanying the word, making the same powerful in operation, 2 Cor. x. 4, 5.

XXIX. *The Altar of Perfume,*
Exodus, xxx. 1—11.

1. It was of shittim-wood, overlaid with gold, and having a crown about it.—Shadowing (as before) Christ, in both his natures, the Deity yielding glory to his humanity, and crowned now with majesty, as the gold adorned the shittim-wood, and circled the altar.

2. It had horns on the four corners thereof, overlaid with gold.—Shadowing the powerful and holy virtue of the intercession of Christ to extend itself to the four corners of the earth, to the comfort of his Church dispersed everywhere, Heb. vii. 25.

3. The incense behoved to be offered only upon it.—Shewing how our prayers must be made in his name, and that through his mediation alone they are acceptable, *Ibid.*

4. It behoved first to be beaten, made and prepared, before it was put on this altar.—Noting how our prayers must proceed out of a humble and contrite spirit, which we offer up in the name of Jesus, Ps. li.; Isa. lxvi. 2.

5. It was kindled by fire upon the altar.—So must our prayers be by a holy and fervent zeal and desire, through the operation and stirring up of the Holy Spirit, Romans, viii. 26.

6. It was offered up by the priest.—So are the prayers of the faithful offered up, and made acceptable to the Father, through the oblation and intercession of our High Priest Jesus. As also, they who offer up acceptable prayers upon the altar of our mediation, are the holy priesthood of the Lord's chosen, Rev. i. 5, 6.

7. No strange incense was to be offered upon this altar.—So no unwarranted or unlawful form of prayer, superstitiously or idolatrously devised, to any saint or angel, is in Christ, or by him any wise to be thought acceptable, Matt. vi. 5—16.

8. The perfume behoved to be perpetually before the Lord.—Shewing thereby, not only the continual exercise of prayer which daily we should use on earth; but also the continual intercession of our Saviour in the heavens for us, Heb. vii. 25.

9. The high priest made this perfume only, and it might not be applied to any other use, but to burn before the Lord.—Teaching that it is only the direction of Christ Jesus which we must follow in praying, according as he hath taught us to say, Our Father, &c. and not to make our petitions to any other in heaven, or on earth, Matt. vi. 9—13.

10. After the clearing of the lamps of the candlestick, evening and morning, then the incense was burnt.—Shewing that our prayers, and all our Christian duties in Christ, must be done according to the light and direction of his word and Spirit, Rom. viii. 26, 27.

11. The incense was made of divers spices.—So must the prayers of the godly be seasoned with divers graces, true repentance, lively faith, unfeigned love, and such like, Psalm li.

12. The incense was offered up in the holy place, without the veil of the holiest, near to the testimony before the mercy seat.—So the prayers of the godly in his Church here on earth, must proceed out of a holy heart, be made agreeable to the testimony of God's word, and through faith have an eye ever to

Christ Jesus, our true mercy-seat, in him and for his sake to be heard by the Father, John, xiv. 13.

13. Once a year the altar was sprinkled with the blood of the expiatory sacrifice.—Shewing how Christ is, by his blood shed, consecrated our blessed Mediator, and that no prayer is acceptable to God, but that man's, who, through the blood of Christ, is reconciled to him, *Ibid.*

XXX. *The altar of burnt-offering,* Exodus, xxvii. 1—9.

1. It was of brass, in the court of the sanctuary.—Shewing how that Christ Jesus, although now shining in glory, (like the golden ark in the holiest,) yet in the world he should abase himself, (like brass,) coming in the shape of a servant, Isa. liii. 2, 3.

2. This altar was but one, and in one place, and the sacrifice to be offered thereon in this one place.—Figuring thereby that we have but one altar of redemption and salvation, Christ Jesus alone, who only once, and in one place, hath offered up a sufficient unreiterable sacrifice for mankind, Heb. vii. 27.

3. It had four horns on the four corners thereof.—Signifying the spiritual strength of Christ, which should be manifested to the four corners of the earth, and that with a strong faith flying thither, we should, in all our distresses, stay only on him, and bind our carnal affections to the altar's horns, by captivating them to Christ, 2 Cor. v. 15.

4. It had a brazen grate in the midst thereof, whereon the fire was put.—Representing the humbled soul of our blessed Saviour, which did bear the fire of God's wrath for our sins, Isa. liii.

5. It had diverse instruments serving for the same.—Typifying the sundry callings that Christ hath in his Church, for the glory of his name, and edifying of his Church, 1 Cor. xii.

6. It was to be cleansed seven days, and sanctified: so it was most holy, and whatsoever touched it was holy, Exod. xxix. 37.—Figuring thereby the perfect sanctifying of our most holy altar Christ Jesus: and that whosoever toucheth him by true faith, is made holy by him, 1 Cor. i. 30.

7. Also, the grate or net-work purged the sacrifice.—To shew that even so doth Christ Jesus purge our sacrifices offered on him, and maketh them acceptable, Rom. v. 1, 2.

8. This altar was hollow between the boards.—Signifying thereby the humiliation and death of Christ, Phil. ii. 6—8.

9. Last, in that it behoved the shittim-wood to be overlaid with brass, that thereby it might endure the fire.—It figured, that so the human nature of Christ (the holy) was unable to endure God's wrath, as it did, except supported and strengthened by the Deity, John iii. 34.

XXXI. *The brazen laver,* Ex. xxx. 18—22.

1. The brazen laver served for the priests to wash their hands and feet thereat, before they ministered before the Lord.—Typifying that inward baptism by Christ's blood, wherewith the holy priesthood of his chosen must be washed and sanctified in action and affection, before their service can be acceptable, Eph. v. 26.

2. After the priests had washed themselves clean, and arrayed themselves with clean linen, then they entered into the holy place.—So after that the godly are inwardly washed by the blood of Christ, and have received the garment of his righteousness, unto sanctification, then it is that they become members of his true Church, 1 Cor. xii. 13.

3. They shall wash themselves (saith the Lord) lest they die.—So must we be purged (as is said) and sanctified by the Spirit of grace, if we would not incur eternal death and damnation, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Mark, xvi. 15, 16.

4. He that toucheth the laver, it being anointed with the holy oil (as all other things in the holy, and in the most holy place were) shall be holy, saith the same Lord.—Shewing how all they, who by a lively faith touch the Lord Jesus (who is anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows) shall be in acceptation and reputation, accounted likewise holy before the Lord, Rom. iv. 23—25.

THE DISPARITY OF ALL THE FORMER.

These things of the tabernacle were material and earthly; but that which is represented by them, is spiritual and heavenly; the one was perishable, the other endureth for ever. For Israel in the flesh, only to abide in Jerusalem, the first was ordained; but for the Israel in the spirit, even the Church universal, wherever pure hands are lifted up, the second is open and prepared, Psalm cxli. 2: the former were under the law, and Moses, typifying things to come; the latter is under the gospel and the Messiah, exhibiting the things themselves.

XXXII. *The burnt-offering of beasts,* Lev. i. 1—14, and vi. 9—13.

1. The burnt-offering of beasts, behoved to be of those which were horned.—Signifying thereby the princely and priestly offices of Christ, which that beast seeks to counterfeit, Rev. xiii. 11, in being horned like the lamb, but speaking like the dragon.

2. They behoved also to be of the tame sort, as of the herd or flocks, and not of wild savage beasts, which by force are brought to death.—Shewing thereby that Christ should be meek and mild in life, and patient in

death itself, like a lamb led to the shambles, Isaiah, liii. 7.

3. They were required in like manner to be of the male kind, and young.—Shadowing thereby the excellency of strength in Jesus Christ, proper to that sex and age.

4. They must be without blemish, and presented voluntarily.—Thereby noting the purity and perfection of holiness in Christ, who should willingly lay down his life, and offer up himself for the salvation of mankind, John, x. 17, 18.

5. They were to be presented at the door of the tabernacle to be slain. — Typifying thereby that by the oblation of Christ, and by his blood shed, both our entry is made (as by a door) into the Church here, and into the heavens hereafter, Heb. x. 19, 20.

6. They must lay their hands upon the head of the beast, who brought it. — Signifying thereby the imputation of our sins upon Christ, for which he suffered, and that we must lay our hand by a true faith upon him, if we look for any comfort from his death and passion, Isaiah, liii. 5.

7. Then the burnt-offering was slain. — Signifying that so Christ should die, and behoved to be crucified, that by his death life might come to us, *Ibid.*

8. The blood thereof was sprinkled round about the altar. — Noting the all-sufficiency of Christ's death, and the extent of his atonement, with the preaching thereof universally throughout the whole world, Matt. xxviii. 19.

9. The skin thereof was plucked off, and cut in pieces.—Hereby shewing the grievousness of Christ's suffering, and his extreme dereliction, being stript, as it were, of all divine or human help, comfort, or regard, when he cried, Why hast thou forsaken me? Matt. xxvii. 46.

10. The body, the head, and the fat, and all were laid upon the fire.—Shewing thereby, how Christ should suffer for us, both in body and in soul, Isa. liii. 12.

11. The inwards and legs thereof were to be washed in water.—Shadowing thereby how Christ should bring no uncleanness unto his passion: but he should be clean both inwardly and outwardly; in mind, and in walking, Heb. vii. 26.

12. This burnt-offering was called a sweet savour unto the Lord.—Which in Christ's death is solely and only accomplished, whereby God's wrath is appeased, and his justice satisfied, Phil. ii. 14—17; Eph. v. 2.

13. Of the flocks, it was a lamb, a ram, or a goat.—Signifying that Christ should be meek, the guide or leader of his flock, and have sin, but only by imputation, Isa. liii.

14.—The burnt-offering of the flocks shall be killed on the north side of the altar.— Shewing not only, that all these oblations were but a dark starry light, (the sun not rising in that quarter, but being opposite unto him in his highest splendour,) but also that Christ should die at Jerusalem; whereof the prophet saith, On the north side is the city of the great King, Dan. ix. 26; Ps. xlviii. 2.

15. The priest shall put off his garments, and put on his linen breeches, and take away the ashes, when the fire hath consumed the burnt-offering, Lev. vi. 11.—Noting thereby, how that Christ, being stript of his clothes, should suffer in nakedness and innocency, and after he had finished the work of our redemption on the cross, should be buried, and then swallow up death in immortality, Hos. xiii. 14.

16. The ashes behoved to be carried without the host, and put in a clean place.— Shadowing thereby, how Christ should be buried without Jerusalem, in a tomb where never man was laid, and how his body should never see corruption, Luke, xxiii. 53.

17. The fire which consumed the burnt-offering came down from heaven.—Typifying either that wrath which for our sakes seized on Christ Jesus in the garden and on the cross, which came from the Father, or that love which moved Christ to suffer for mankind, which was heavenly and free, John, xv. 13.

18. This fire was to be continually upon the altar.—Shadowing the constant unchangeableness of that love of his to his Church, and recent virtue of his merit and death, Heb. vii. 24, 25.

19. This fire was to be fed, that it went not out, and no other fire was to be used but this in the sanctuary.—Teaching us how carefully we should entertain the love and Spirit of Christ, by holiness of life and obedience, and that we should try the spirits, and admit no other spirit but the spirit of Christ in his word, to rule and to teach his Church, 1 John, iv. 1.

20. The skin of the burnt-offering went to the priest, Lev. vii. 8.—Shewing thereby not only the maintenance that they should have who preach the gospel, as they that served at the altar lived of the altar, 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14, but also that the righteousness of Jesus must be apprehended by his chosen and holy priesthood of the godly, by the hand of true faith, unto justification and sanctification, Rom. v.

XXXIII. *The burnt-offering of fowls,* Lev. i. 14, to the end.

1. The burnt-offering of fowls was of turtles, or pigeons. — Shewing thereby the simplicity, meekness, and innocency of Christ, Isaiah, liii. 7.

2. The neck thereof shall be pinched with the nail, that the blood might go out; but not that the head should be plucked off from the body.—Shadowing how Christ should die, and shed his blood, yet thereby his deity (as

the head or principal part) should not be divided from his humanity; nor yet by his death should he, who is our head, be taken from the body of his Church, but should rise again, and be with them by his Spirit for ever, John, xiv.

3. The maw and feathers were to be cast away as unclean. — To shew thereby that Christ should bring no uncleanness, (as is said before,) to his suffering, but should be offered up spotless to his Father, Isaiah, liii. 9.

4. The priest did cleave it with its wings, but not divide it asunder. — Noting thereby, that although Christ died, yet he should not thereby be quite extinguished, but should rise again, live, and ascend to heaven; as also to the same is to be referred the signification of this, Not a bone of him should be broken, Exod. xii. 46.

5. The blood thereof was strained or pressed out at the side of the altar, before it was plucked, and laid upon the altar to be burned. — Shadowing thereby the straining or pressing out of Christ's blood in his agony, before he was taken and stript to be crucified, Luke, xxii. 44.

XXXIV. *The daily sacrifice*, Exodus, xxix. 38—45.

1. The daily sacrifice was a lamb. — So our sacrifice, not daily, but once for all, offered unto the Father, is the lamb Christ Jesus, Heb. vii. 27.

2. It was slain in the morning, and in the evening. — To shew not only that morning and evening we should exercise ourselves in the worship of God; but also, that it was not in the latter days alone that Christ was slain, but was so in the Lord's decree, lively apprehension of faith, and virtue of his death, to all true believers, from the beginning of the world, John, i. 29; Rev. xiii. 8.

3. It was to be offered up with fine flour, beaten oil, and wine. — To shew that Christ by his death and oblation becomes not only unto us redemption, but spiritual food, gladness, and cheering comfort, yea all in all unto us, 1 Cor. i. 30.

4. Where this sacrifice was offered, there the Lord made appointment to speak unto Israel, and shew himself, Exod. xxix. 42. — To signify, that in Christ, and through his death and bloodshed, the new appointment, or covenant of his will, and manifestation of his grace and mercy, is established to his Church, Heb. ix. 15.

XXXV. *The Sin-offering.*

1. The blood of the sin-offering, what beast soever it were, was to be poured out.—Shewing, how the blood of Christ Jesus, our true sin-offering, behoved to be poured out and shed upon the cross. For without blood-shedding there was no reconciliation, Heb. ix. 22.

2. The priest shall dip his finger in the blood of the bullock that is a sin-offering, and sprinkle thereof seven times before the Lord. — Shadowing the perfection of that expiation, and satisfaction for sin, which Christ should make, in the virtue, quality, and perpetuity thereof, (the number of seven being the number of perfection,) Heb. x. 14.

3. The priest shall bring in of the blood of the bullock into the tabernacle of the congregation.—Shewing thereby, how the merit of Christ's blood should enter into the holiest heavens to appease wrath, satisfy justice, and conciliate favour, and be a perfect purgation to his elect Church, Heb. ix. 12—14; Eph. v. 25—27.

4. Of the blood, the priest shall put some also upon the four horns of the altar.—Signifying thereby, how the preaching of the gospel concerning the blood of Christ, should be published and proclaimed to the four corners of the earth, Matt. xxviii. 19.

5. And all the rest of the blood shall be poured out at the foot of the altar.—Figuring thereby, the abundant shedding of the blood of Christ, and superabundant merit thereof, Acts, xxii. 16; 1 John, i. 7. As likewise, that although it be so abundant and sufficient for all, yet it is not efficient to all, but is unprofitably poured out to many, through their own contempt and incredulous induration, Mat. xxiii. 37; Heb. x. 29.

6. All the fat upon the inwards was to be burnt, and offered to the Lord.—To shew that all the best we have, even our inwards, of soul, heart, and best affections, we should offer unto the Lord, Psal. cxvi. 12—19; Rom. xii. 1. As also, that not only should the body of Christ suffer, but his soul likewise, (like the fat in the inwards, which is the best part,) as in his agony and cry on the cross is evident, Mat. xxvii. 46.

7. The rest of the whole bullock (typifying Christ in strength) shall be carried out of the host, and be burnt upon the wood in the fire, where the ashes were cast out.—Signifying that even so Christ Jesus should suffer without the gate in the place of dead men's skulls, and not in the city, Heb. xiii. 11, 12. And teaching us thereby, likewise to bear his reproach, going in affection out of this earthly city of the world, and our body seeking a better, Heb. xiii. 13, 14.

8. The priest shall eat the sin-offering in the holy place, whose blood was not brought into the tabernacle of the congregation.—Shewing that Christ Jesus in his Church is not only reconciliation, but also blessed food for all those that are a holy and royal priesthood through him, John, vi. 53—55.

9. If any of the blood of the sin-offering

was dropped upon a garment, it might not be carried out so, but washed in the holy place. —Signifying thereby, not only that holy things should not be profaned; but also that without the Church there is no participation in the blood of Christ, and so no salvation, Matt. vii. 6; Mark, xvi. 15, 16; Heb. x. 28, 29.

10. The earthen vessel wherein the sin-offering that was eaten was sodden, was broken: but if a brazen pot, it was scoured and washed. —Expressing either the wonderful pollution of sin, that so hardly can be done away; or, that those who have received reconciliation through Christ, ought not to give themselves again unto the world, but keep themselves clean and undefiled from the wickedness thereof, 2 Cor. v. 14, 15.

11. If a private person sin, (and not the priest, the congregation, or a ruler,) such an one shall offer a she-goat or a female lamb for a sin-offering.—Yielding thereby a comfort to all women, that for that sex Christ should die as well as for men, and by faith through Christ, they should be co-heirs of his kingdom, Gal. iii. 28.

12. And if he were of the poorer sort, he should offer of turtles, or pigeons, (the signification whereof see in the burnt-offering of fowls,) or of fine flour, without putting oil or incense thereto, for it is a sin-offering.—Whereby was shadowed, that with Christ Jesus our sin-offering, in the work of satisfaction, we should join nothing else, be it ever so plausible in man's conceit, 1 Cor. iii. 10—22.

13. And the priest shall make atonement, (still this is repeated.)—So ever signifying, that not in these sacrifices, but in the priesthood, was the matter which typified Christ's office of reconciliation and intercession, by which alone we are accepted, Heb. vii. 25—27.

THE DISPARITY.

These sacrifices were of beasts; but our sacrifice was of the Son of God himself. These could never sanctify the comers thereunto, Heb. x. 1; but in them was a yearly remembrance of sins, ver. 3: but our sacrifice Christ Jesus, sanctifieth all those that by a true faith draw near unto him, purging the conscience from dead works, to serve the living Lord. For the blood of those sacrifices, such as bulls and goats, could not take away sin; but by the blood of Christ we have full remission. These sacrifices were often offered, in token of their imperfection, and the similitudes of heavenly things were purified only with their blood; but our sacrifice was once only offered, in token of the perfection thereof, and by the same, as by a better sacrifice, were the heavenly things themselves purified and consecrated, Heb. ix. 23—25.

XXXVI. *The Meat-offering*, Leviticus, ii. and vi. 14—19.

1. It was called a meat-offering.—Because it was an acknowledgment that they did hold their meat or food of God, and had received it of his blessing; and because part thereof went as meat unto the priest: as likewise, teaching us, that Christ Jesus is the true meat, and comfortable nourishment of every hungry soul, once for all offered to his Father, and daily in his word and sacraments offered and exhibited to us, John, vi. 53—58.

2. If it be of flour, it shall be fine flour, Lev. ii. 1.—Shewing thereby, that we should offer our best things to the Lord, and not the blind and the lame; and noting thereby also, the purity and perfection of Christ, Heb. vii. 26.

3. Oil shall be poured, and incense put thereon.—Signifying, that with gladness and delight our worship of the Lord should be, either in devotion towards himself, or distribution towards his saints, Heb. xiii. 15, 16: as also typifying thereby that loving kindness, and sweet comfortable mediation of Christ for his Church, Heb. vii. 25.

4. It must be presented to the priest, and he shall bring it to the altar, ver. 2.—Shadowing that it is by Christ, and his oblation, that all our works, and duties of God's worship are acceptable, He interceeding for us, *Ibid.*

5. That portion of it which was burnt was for a memorial of a sweet savour before the Lord.—Prefiguring, that even so Christ Jesus, by his death and merit, should be an eternal memorial before his Father to be merciful to us, Heb. ix. 24.

6. The meat-offering which was cooked and prepared, was baked, fried, or sodden.—Shewing thereby the painful and manifold sufferings of Christ; and how our worship of God should not be lukewarm or indifferent, Rev. iii. 16.

7. It must be without leaven, ver. 4.—Prefiguring that our worship of God must be without malice of our neighbour; as also the perfect purity of Christ's life and doctrine, 1 Cor. v. 8.

8. It must have no honey, which although it be sweet in taste, is bitter in effect, engendering choler, which also surfeiteth the eater of too much thereof, and being burnt, hath no good smell, ver. 11.—Pointing out thereby unto us the nature of Christ, in whom there is no such sweetness as engendereth bitterness or hurt to any faithful eater; of whom also we can never receive too much to surfeit, and whose death and oblation smelleth most sweetly before God, and to every distressed conscience, Heb. vii.

9. All meat-offerings behoved to have salt,

wherewith they were salted, ver. 13.—Signifying thereby, that as salt seasoneth, and keepeth from corruption ; so Christ is he who, like savoury salt, seasoneth us and all our works, and makes them acceptable, and that with the salt of sanctification in Christ we should season all our worship of the Father, keeping ourselves from the corruption of hypocrisy and wickedness, Mark, ix. 49.

10. The meat-offering of the first-fruits shall be ears of corn dried by the fire, and wheat, beaten out of the husks, ver. 14.—Whereby was figured, not only that our worship of God, (as is said,) should be in sincerity and zeal, going out of ourselves to lay hold on Christ ; but also, what wrath Christ should suffer, and divers pains for our sake, who is the first-fruits of all flesh, by whom all the field of the whole race of mankind is truly sanctified, and by his oblation perfectly redeemed, Isa. liii. ; Heb. x. 14.

11. The priest and his sons shall eat of the meat-offering in the holy place, without leaven.—Showing that so the Lord's ministers and their families are to be maintained, and live by their calling : as also, that the holy priesthood of the godly in the Church enjoy the benefit of Christ only, and there must feed upon him by faith in a purged conscience, 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14 ; John, vi. 27—50.

12. Every meat-offering of the priest shall be burnt altogether, it shall not be eaten.—Whereby was shadowed the perfection of that oblation made by Christ, wherein no part is left to man in that matter, by merit, or penal satisfaction, Heb. vii. 25.

XXXVII. *The Peace-offering*, Lev. iii. and vii. 11—35.

Wherein this offering was alike with the rites of the burnt or sin-offering, the signification needs not repetition, and wherein they were unlike is,—

1. All the fat, with the rump hard by the backbone, was offered and burnt before the Lord, Lev. iii. 9.—Shadowing not only the full obedience of Christ extensively unto death itself ; but that we also in our obedience unto the Father, and offering of our best things unto him, should persevere unto the end, Rev. ii. 10.

2. A part of the peace-offering went to him that brought it.—Whereby was figured that Christ should die for all ; and the people as well as the priest should have a portion, and a blessing in him, Isa. xlv. 22—25.

3. But they must neither eat the fat nor the blood, ver. 17.—Signifying, that all they who have a part in Christ, must neither be carnal nor cruel ; but sacrifice their carnality by mortification, and be meek as the master, Mat. xi. 29 ; 2 Cor. vii. 1 ; 1 Pet. ii. 23.

4. The peace-offering shall be offered up with cakes of leavened bread, Lev. vii. 13.—Shadowing, that as leaven seasoneth the bread, and makes it to rise and heave up ; so Christ Jesus is he who makes us and all our actions savoury before God, lightening our hearts with joy of his Spirit, and making our souls in love, thankfulness, and true comfort, to heave up to God, Psal. ciii.

5. Of all the sacrifices, he shall offer but one cake for a heave-offering, Lev. vii. 14.—Signifying the simplicity or sincerity of our thankfulness, and worship of God, which should be true and from the heart, Psalm cxvi. 12—21.

6. The flesh of the offering for thanksgiving must be eaten the same day, and for a vow, within two days at the farthest, none might be eaten the third day, but burnt if ought remained, Lev. vii. 16, 17.—Teaching us not to prolong our duty of thankfulness and sanctification ; but, for benefits daily renewed, constantly to practise the same : and that delayed thanksgiving, which seldom is sincere, is rejected by God, Deut. viii. 10.

7. If any unclean person eat of the flesh of the peace-offering, he shall be cut off from his people, ver. 20.—Forewarning us of that fearful destruction and punishment that abides all carnal professors, who will be thought partakers of Christ, and yet lead an unclean and unconscionable life, Matt. vii. 21—24.

8. The flesh that toucheth any unclean thing, shall not be eaten ; but as unclean itself, shall be burnt, Lev. vii. 19.—Shewing us that the holy things of God are not to be profaned, nor that we should eat with the guiltiness of wickedness and iniquity, 1 Cor. xi. 29.

9. The offerer shall bring the sacrifice with his own hands, ver. 30.—Teaching us thereby, that every one is accepted, and liveth, by his own faith, Rom. v. 1 ; Gal. iii. 11.

10. It must be heaved up before the Lord, *ibid.*—Noting, the heaving up of our hearts in due thanksgiving to God, and professing of the benefits received, Hos. xiv. 2 ; as also the heaving or lifting up of Christ Jesus upon the cross for us.

11. It must be shaken to and fro, east, west, north, and south.—Shadowing the public thanksgiving of the faithful in the congregation of his saints, to the Lord, whose presence is everywhere ; as also, the proclaiming or publishing of the death of Christ in the gospel, that should be made known through all the parts of the world, Mat. xxiv. 44.

12. The right shoulder and breast was heaved up before the Lord, and then given unto the priests for their portion, ver. 34.—Signifying, not only that in action and affection our thankfulness should be to God ; but also that Christ Jesus, heaved up for us, is

both breast and shoulder, that is, wisdom and strength to all his elect priesthood whose portion he is, 1 Cor. i. 30.

XXXVIII. *The solemn yearly Sacrifice of the Bullock and Goat,* Leviticus, xvi.

1. Of the two he-goats, it was by lot that the one was taken, and the other escaped, Lev. xvi. 8. — So was it by the secret decree of the Lord's allotment, that Christ should suffer, that so we might escape damnation, Psalm xl. 7; Heb. ix. 22.

2. That on which the lot fell, was made a sin-offering for the people, ver. 9.—So Christ whom the Lord decreed in his eternal counsel, and chose to be offered for mankind, was made a sin-offering for his Church, Heb. vii. 27.

3. Its blood, as also the blood of the bullock, was brought within the vail, and was sprinkled upon and before the mercy-seat, on the east side which was towards the people, ver. 14, 15.—So is the merit of the blood of Jesus brought within the holiest heavens, before the throne of grace, to plead for mercy for us, Heb. ix. 23, 24.

4. The holy place was purged thereby from the uncleanness of the children of Israel, ver. 16. — So is not only the Church purged by the blood of Jesus, but heaven itself sanctified, as it were, and prepared to be a place of rest for his own chosen, Heb. ix. 23.

5. No man shall be in the tabernacle when the priest goes in to make atonement in the holy place, until he come out again, and have made it, and he only shall make the atonement, ver. 17. — Signifying thereby, that no creature is partner with him in the work of man's redemption, but he alone is the perfect Saviour and Mediator of his Church, Heb. vii. 25.

6. The altar of incense shall be sprinkled with the blood of the goat.—Shadowing, that through his own blood, he should be consecrated our intercessor, and through the merit thereof our prayers should be accepted, Heb. ix. 12—15.

7. The high priest shall cast off his glorious garments when he makes this atonement. ver. 4. — Prefiguring, that even so should Christ Jesus the glory of his divine majesty, while in the shape of a servant he should finish the work of man's atonement and reconciliation, Isa. liii.

8. Once a-year only this atonement was made, ver. 34.—Shewing, that not often, but once for ever, without repetition, that perfect atonement should be made by Christ Jesus' own blood, whereby he should enter into the holiest heavens, to appear for us before God eternally, Heb. ix. 24—26.

9. The day of atonement shall be a Sabbath for ever, ver. 31.—Shadowing thereby, that by the atonement and expiation of Christ. rest everlasting should be obtained for us, and in his death all other typical sacrifices should have their end and rest, Heb. x. 11—14.

XXXIX. *The Scape-Goat,* Leviticus, xvi.

1. The scape-goat was so called because he escaped alive.—Representing so Christ Jesus, who, notwithstanding he died for our sins, according to his humanity, yet could not be detained or overcome by death; but proclaiming his victory over death and the grave, by virtue of his impassible Deity, rose again triumphantly, Matt. xxviii. 6.

2. It was presented alive, that by it reconciliation might be made, Lev. xvi. 10.—Signifying that all mankind being dead in sin, He only was presented alive, even fully righteous and holy, to make reconciliation for us, Heb. vii. 26.

3. With both hands upon its head were confessed the sins and trespasses of the whole people, and it did bear them all, ver. 21. — Shewing, how even so Christ Jesus should bear all the sins both great and small of his elect, and satisfy for them, and how that we by a true faith ought to lay them all upon him, Rom. v.

4. So bearing all their iniquities, it was sent unto a land of separation, saith the original, ver. 22. — Figuring, that even so should Christ Jesus, bearing the iniquities of his chosen, be carried out of Jerusalem unto death, whereby his soul was separated from his body for a time, Isa. liii. 12; Heb. xiii. 12.

5. It was led out by a man appointed, ver. 21. — Noting thereby, that the sins of man, even of so many as are appointed to be saved by him, led Christ forth to suffer, Isa. liii. 5.

6. He who led it forth, had to wash his flesh and clothes after his return, and then come into the host, ver. 26. — Signifying thereby, not only that that which caused Christ to die was the pollution of our souls; but also, that whosoever hath laid his hand on Christ by a true faith, must lead a clean and holy life, if he would be accepted as one of Christ's Church, purifying himself from all uncleanness and iniquity, 2 Cor. v. 15.

XL. *The cleansing of the leper,* Lev. xiv.

1. The bird that was killed for that use, was a sparrow, one of the clean sort of birds, by whose blood the leper to be cleansed behoved to be sprinkled seven times, Lev. xiv. 7. — Representing so the Lord Jesus, who like a sparrow was of small account in the world, clean and innocent, by whose blood our leprous souls, to be cleansed, must be perfectly sprinkled, Isa. lii. 14, 15.

2. This sparrow was killed over pure water, in an earthen vessel, Lev. xiv. 5.—Designating thereby Christ Jesus, who hath suffered for us; his innocency and clearness in our human nature, Heb. vii. 26.

3. The live sparrow being dipt with cedar-wood, scarlet, and hyssop, in the blood of the sparrow slain, was let go into the open field, ver. 6, 7. — Shadowing thereby, how that man, by a true faith, (which hath ever with it a fervent love, and a sweet sanctified life,) bathing himself in the blood of Christ, by his death attains both to life and freedom, John, xiv. 6.

4. As also the dipping of the live sparrow into the blood of the dead, and that of necessity behoving to be so.—Signified, that the impassible Deity of Christ can no ways yield comfort to us, considered alone, concerning the remission of sins, without the human nature of Jesus Christ, that suffered for us the death of the cross, Acts, xx. 28; John, i. 14; Heb. ii. 14.

5. And the letting of the live sparrow fly in the open air or broad field, ver. 7.—Shadowed Christ Jesus by death once consecrated to be the author of eternal salvation, that he should ascend on high, and be seated in the holiest heavens, Heb. x. 5—12.

6. The leper that is healed, must wash his clothes, and his flesh, and shave off his hair, after he is discerned by the priest to be clean, before he can enter into the host, and after that must remain seven days before entering into his tent, ver. 8, 9. — Shewing that a rebellious or scandalous person by excommunication separate from the Church, becoming penitent, must not be again rashly received, without evident proofs of his repentance given both to pastor and people. 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15; 2 Tim. ii. 25, 26.

7. The putting of the blood, then, of his trespass-offering upon the right ear, thumb, and toe of him that was leper, and of the oil upon all those places, and his head, after he had washed himself, Lev. xiv. 17.—Signified the perfect expiation of the sins of every penitent in Christ's blood, and consecration of them to sanctification and cleanness of life thereafter, Acts, viii. 22; Rom. xii. 1, 2.

XLI. *The sacrifice of the red heifer, and the sprinkling water*, Numbers, xix.

1. The colour of the heifer was red, Num. xix. 2.—Whereby was represented the bloodiness of the Saviour in his passion, Luke, xxii. 44.

2. She behoved to be without blemish, upon whom never yoke came, *Ibid.*—Signifying thereby, the perfect holiness of Christ, who never bore the yoke of sinfulness, nor was subject to the precepts of man, Isa. liii.

3. She was burned without the host, and her blood seven times sprinkled before the tabernacle of the congregation, ver. 4.—Shewing how Christ should suffer without the city, and his blood should be a perfect purging of his Church, Heb. xiii. 12.

4. She shall be all burned, and cedar-wood, scarlet, and hyssop shall be cast into the fire with her, ver. 6.—Shadowing how that nothing in Christ is unprofitable, and that through the eternal Spirit, by the shedding of his blood, he should offer up himself wholly without fault unto God, to purge our consciences from dead works to serve the living God, an uncorrupt life, a fervent love to mankind, and savoury obedience in all things to his Father, accompanying him in his sufferings, Heb. ix. 14; Eph. iv. 2.

5. The ashes of this sin-offering were laid up in a clean place, to be made a sprinkling water for the congregation, ver. 9.—Figuring thereby, how the merit of the bloodshed and death of Christ, (the true sin-offering,) in the holiest heavens ever recent, should be a perpetual purging and sprinkling water unto his Church, Heb. ix. 13, 14.

6. That person that is defiled by the dead, and hath not the same sprinkling upon him, shall be cut off from Israel, ver. 13.—Whereby was signified, that that person that is defiled with the corruption of sin, and hath not the blood of Christ sprinkled upon his soul, shall likewise be cut off from the number and inheritance of the saints, Mark, xvi. 16.

7. The priest only shall sprinkle this water upon the unclean person, and purge him.—So it is Christ Jesus only who doth sprinkle his blood upon penitent souls who come unto him; and from him only is to be expected true pardon of our sins, Matt. ix. 6.

The signification of other things, see in the preceding sacrifices.

THE DISPARITY.

This sprinkling water made of the ashes of the heifer, sprinkling them that were unclean, sanctified only as touching the purifying of the flesh; but the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without fault to God, purges the conscience from dead works, to serve the living God, Heb. ix. 13, 14.

XLII. *Joshua.*

1. Joshua, a saviour. — So was Jesus both in name and in deed, Matt. i. 21.

2. He was the son of Nun, which is by interpretation, eternal, and the servant of Moses, Exod. xxiv. — So was Christ the Son of the truly eternal Father, and may be said to be Moses' servant in a sense; because he

followed after Moses in order, and subjected himself unto Moses' law, in fulfilling what it commanded or typified, Matt. v. 17.

3. He overcame the enemies of Israel, and going before them, brought them into the land of Canaan, allotting to each their portion, Joshua, xiii. — So hath Christ overcome the enemies of his Church, and hath ascended up on high into the heavens before us, there to prepare a place for each of us, and to bring us thither, John, xiv. 2.

4. Moses being dead, he was made the captain of God's people; he leading them to the land, but Joshua conducting them in the land, Josh. i. 1—12.—So the law ceasing, and the ceremonies thereof, he was appointed likewise the captain of his Church: the law leading to Christ, and heaven through him; but Christ by his death and conquest giving us entry therein, Heb. ix. 24.

5. He saved Rahab's house that had the red cord hung out at the window, and who received his spies, Joshua, vi. 22, 23.—So doth Christ save the soul of every penitent sinner that hath true faith in his blood, and the expressive grace thereof, receiving his word in their hearts, and the ministers thereof, for his cause, Isaiah, xlix. 6.

6. Under Moses' leading, the cloud went before; but under Joshua it vanished.—So in the time of the law, were obscurity and darkness; but through the light of the gospel under Christ, the same did depart, Heb. vii. 18, 19.

7. Joshua was confirmed in his calling, by the dividing of the waters of Jordan, at the presence of the ark standing therein, Joshua, iii. 14—17.—So was Christ in the same Jordan by the dividing of the heavens, and presence of the Holy Spirit descending and resting upon him, Matt. iii. 16.

8. He led Israel through those waters unto Canaan.—So doth Christ his chosen, through many afflictions, and death itself unto heaven, Psalm xxiii.

9. Moses circumcised not the people; but Joshua, Josh. v. 3. — So the law sanctifieth not, but grace through Christ, Rom. viii. 3; Heb. vii. 19.

10. Manna ceased under Joshua in Canaan, Josh. v. 12. — So shall our knowledge of Christ by word and sacraments cease in that heavenly glory, Rev. xxi. 2, 3.

11. With the sounding of rams' horns by the Levites, the ark compassing Jericho, the high walls thereof fell down, and the inhabitants thereof were overcome by him, Josh. vi. 20.—So by the sound of the word, although contemptible in the mouths of his ministers, Christ humbles the imaginations of men's hearts, and overcomes his adversaries, Acts, ii. 22—42.

12. The earth (as the walls of Jericho) prostrated itself before him; the waters (as those of Jordan) yielded unto him; and the heavens (as the sun and moon by their standing still) obeyed him, Josh. vi. 20; x. 13. — So heaven and earth, and all that are therein, bow themselves in humble obedience to the Lord Jesus, Phil. ii. 10, 11.

13. After the battle, he made his captains tread upon the necks of the Canaanitish kings whom he had overcome, and shut up before, Josh. x. 24.—So will Jesus do to all his chosen at their death, especially at that day of general judgment shall he make their enemies, Satan, sin, and death, with all other their foes, to be their footstool; whose power, even in this life, and day of battle, was abated and confined, Psal. cx. 1, 2.

14. He accepted the Gibeonites, who humbly entreated peace of him, Josh. ix. 3—15. — So doth Christ accept all penitent sinners, who, in the time of grace, come wisely unto him, Luke, xv. 10.

THE DISPARITY.

Joshua conquered Canaan, not only for the people of Israel, but also for himself in part; but Christ Jesus hath purchased that heavenly Canaan only for our sakes, having had it himself before, by the right of inheritance. He conquered it not by himself alone, but with the aid of the tribes of Israel; but Christ hath by himself only purchased that heavenly inheritance: he did the one without his own bloodshed or death; but Christ hath not this other without both these: he could not quite expel the Canaanite out of the land; but Christ Jesus hath fully overcome all our enemies.

XLIII. *Gideon*, Judges, vi. vii. and viii. compared.

1. Gideon, a destroyer or breaker, who is called a judge and saviour of Israel, by miracle confirmed in his calling, vi. 17—22. — So is Christ a destroyer of his enemies, and a judge to judge the cause of his chosen, and to save and deliver them, whose calling was confirmed in like manner by miracles, Matt. iii. 13—17; 1 Cor. xv. 57.

2. Before the battle with his foes, he is comforted by the angel, and assured of victory, ver. 23. — So was Christ before his conflict with death and his other adversaries, comforted in his agony, Luke, xxii. 41—44.

3. He destroyed the altar of Baal, and erected another unto the Lord in that same place, ver. 25—27.—So hath Christ the worship of heathenish idols, and, by the preaching of the gospel, established in place thereof the true worship of God.

4. He offered up a sacrifice, which the Lord, by fire from heaven, declared to be

acceptable.—So hath Christ offered up himself, and with him, likewise, the Lord, by his voice and Spirit from heaven, hath declared himself well pleased, Matt. iii. 17.

5. They who bowed down on their knees to drink of the waters, were counted unfit soldiers for Gideon, vii. 7.—So they who delight in the pleasures of this world, and give themselves unto them, are as unfit for Christ, Jude, 4.

6. Gideon is interpreted, by his adversaries, to be a barley cake, yet which should overturn and throw down their tents, ver. 14.—So was Christ reproached by his enemies in the world, yet shall overthrow them at last, and subdue them unto him, Psal. cx.

7. By the sound of the trumpet, and shining of lamps out of earthen broken vessels, he overcame his enemies, ver. 16—23.—So by the trumpet of his word, and light of the gospel, carried through the world by weak instruments, hath he confounded his adversaries, 1 Cor. i. 27.

8. The swords of his enemies killed themselves, ver. 22.—So doth the malice and practices of the enemies of Christ, against him or his, turn back into their own bowels, Psal. vii. 15.

9. He was very meek, and a man of no contention, as his answer to Ephraim shews, viii. 2.—So was Christ meek and humble, whose voice was not heard in the streets, Isa. xlii. 2.

10. After his victory he severely punished the men of Succoth, who denied him bread in his extremity, ver. 16.—So shall Christ punish those, at that great day, who when he was hungry fed him not, when he hath subdued his enemies, and made them all his footstool, Mat. xxv. 41—46.

11. Gideon refused to reign over Israel, but interceded for them, ver. 22, 23.—So did Christ, being sought by the people, to be a worldly king; but intercedeth in heaven for his Church for ever, John, vi. 15.

THE DISPARITY.

Gideon, not without other associates, as is said of Joshua, overcame his enemies; but Christ alone, without the aid of any creature, overcame his: he was loath a long time to undergo that calling to deliver Israel; but Christ most willingly and readily undertook to deliver mankind: his sons after his death were slain and destroyed; but so cannot the children and sons of Christ be destroyed, their life being in his hands, and one hair of whose head cannot fall to the ground without his good will and pleasure: he left an ephod with the people, which thereafter induced them to idolatry; but Christ hath left his word with his Church, to preserve them from the same for ever.

XLIV. *Jephthah*, Judges, xi. and xii. compared.

1. Jephthah, or opening.—So is Christ the opening and manifestation of his Father's will to us, of our hearts also to himself, and of the gates of that heavenly paradise to our souls after death, Heb. ix.; John, xiv. 2.

2. Jephthah was rejected of his brethren, and yet the Lord appointed none other to save and deliver them, but him.—So Christ, although he came to his own, yet they received him not, but disdainfully refused him; and yet the Lord decreed him to be the only deliverer of his people, and that by no other name under heaven we should look for salvation, but by the name of Jesus, Phil. ii.; Acts, iv. 12.

3. In the time of a great bondage, he is stirred up to be a deliverer of Israel.—So in the time of the universal bondage of sin, Satan, and death, which had captivated and enthralled all men, Christ Jesus came to deliver his Church, Hosea, xi. 1; 1 Cor. xv.

4. He punished and subdued after his victory the rebellious Ephraimites.—So shall Christ at the consummation of all things fully subdue all his rebellious enemies, Psal. cx.

THE DISPARITY.

Jephthah was begotten in sin and whoredom; but Christ was begotten without sin in virginity: Jephthah offered his daughter, which was an unlawful and unacceptable sacrifice unto the Lord; but Christ offered himself as a holy and acceptable sacrifice unto his Father.

XLV. *Samson*, Judges, xiii. xiv. xv. xvi.

1. Samson, or Shimshon, there the second time; because the angel appeared twice unto his parents; or he was so called from Shemesh, which signifieth the sun.—So did the angel appear once to Mary at the annunciation, and the second time to Joseph in a dream, acquainting him concerning the mystery of Christ's conception, who is our sun of righteousness, Matt. i. 20; Luke, i. 26—39.

2. Israel was in great thraldom and misery before his birth.—So were the Jews and the whole world in the slavery of sin and ignorance before Christ's birth, Rom. iii. 10—18.

3. Unexpectedly the angel comes to his mother, and, although she was barren, promiseth that she should bear a son who should deliver Israel.—So did the angel to Mary; and, although she was a virgin, promises the same likewise, Luke, i. 30, 31.

4. The angel confirmed his promise by a sign to Samson's mother.—So did the angel

to Mary, in saying, "And behold, thy cousin Elizabeth," &c. ver. 36.

5. Samson's parents were at first terrified and astonished, but thereafter were comforted. —So were Mary and Joseph at first troubled in mind, but thereafter by Christ's birth comforted, Luke, i. 29 ; Matt. i. 19, 20.

6. Samson grew, and the spirit waxed strong within him ; and he was a Nazarite.— So did Christ in body, and in favour with God and man, and the Spirit was not measured unto him ; and he was also a Nazarite, Luke, ii. 52 ; John, iii. 34.

7. He took not a wife of his own people, but a stranger of the Philistines.— So hath Christ his Church, not so much of Jews as Gentiles, who were aliens from God, Isaiah, lv. 5.

8. He essayed his strength first on a lion who assaulted him in the way, (when he was going to seek his wife,) out of which, a little thereafter, he took forth honey.— So did Christ manifest his matchless strength, first on Satan, who tempted him in the wilderness, when he was entering on his calling after baptism, and overcame him. From which we who are tempted in like manner may receive this comfort, that he who overcame for us, will also overcome in us, Heb. iv. 15.

9. He put forth his mind to the Philistines in a riddle.—So did Christ his doctrine to the pharisees in parables, Matt. xiii. 34.

10. He was sold by Delilah for money, and under show of love is betrayed to the Philistines.—So was Christ by Judas, for thirty pieces of money, and with a kiss of salutation was betrayed to the priests, scribes, and pharisees, Matt. xxvi. 15, 49.

11. He was bound, led away blinded, and at their feast brought forth, bound to a pillar and mocked ; but by that pillar, and pulling down thereof, he destroyed more of his enemies at his death, than he did in his life. — So was Christ bound, led away, blinded with blood and spittle, and at last, at the feast of the passover, was nailed to the cross, and mocked ; and in like manner, by his death on the cross, he destroyed his enemies in a greater degree than he had ever done previously in the course of his life, Luke, xxii. 63, 64 ; 1 Cor. xv. 57.

12. His brethren thereafter buried him. — So after Christ's death, Joseph of Arimathea and others of the godly buried him, Luke, xxiii. 50—54.

13. The strength of Samson for a time continued unexercised in the prison.—So did the power of Christ's deity in the grave.

14. Although he was watched in Gaza, that he might not escape ; yet when all were asleep, he took off the gates of the city, and carried them away unto the mountain. — So Christ was watched in the grave, that he might not be taken away ; and yet he gloriously arose, overcoming the power of death and the grave, and carrying the triumphant victory thereof with him unto heaven, Mat. xxvii. 63—66.

THE DISPARITY.

Samson lost his former strength when he was betrayed, and was apprehended because he could not resist ; but so lost not Christ Jesus his powerful strength when he was betrayed, which he did manifest, by his word, asking, Whom seek ye? and saying, I am he ; in making the soldiers that came to take him fall backward to the ground ; and in that he said to Peter, that he was able to command millions of angels to assist him if he listed ; so that willingly he offered himself, and was not violently taken. Also, Samson's wife was taken from him, and given to another ; but the spouse of Christ, his Church, can no creature take out of his hand. The overthrow of his enemies, was his overthrow likewise, and as they died, so he died : but so it was not with Christ, for they only did bruise his heel, but he did break their head ; they assaulted him only violently, but he wounded them mortally, and overcame.

XLVI. *Samuel*, 1 Samuel, i. compared.

1. Samuel, or Shemuel, appointed or heard of God. — So was Christ appointed to be the Saviour of mankind, and was heard of the Lord in all things he desired, Heb. v. 7 ; John, xi. 42.

2. He was in favour with God and man, 1 Sam. ii. 26. — So was Christ, and did grow in both, Luke, ii. 53.

3. He was called of God, and the Lord manifested his will to him, 1 Sam. iii. 4. — So was Christ called of the Father, and had the clear and full manifestation of his will to declare to mankind, John, viii. 28, 29 ; Acts, vii. 37.

4. He was born, contrary to the expectation of any, of the barren womb of Hannah, and dedicated to the Lord, 1 Sam. i. 20. — So was Christ of the blessed womb of a chaste Virgin Mary, and consecrated unto the Father, Matt. i. 18—25.

5. He was priest, prophet, and ruler in Israel, 1 Sam. i. 21 ; vii. 15.—So is Christ all these most truly in his Church, Heb. ix. ; John, viii. 42.

6. He was most diligent and faithful in God's work, and of a most innocent life, 1 Sam. vii. 16 ; xii. 3, 4.—So was Christ Jesus in all these incomparable and matchless.

7. He was ungratefully used by the people, who, rejecting his government, craved another to be a king, and to reign over them, 1 Sam. xii. 6—16.—Even so was Christ by the Jews,

(his own people, whom so fain he would have gathered,) who, repudiating him likewise, professed that they had no king but Cæsar, John, xix. 15.

THE DISPARITY.

The sons of Samuel were wicked, and walked not in his ways; but the children and sons of Jesus Christ are holy and sanctified, and tread in his footsteps, following the example of his life. He delivered the government unto wicked Saul; but so shall Christ Jesus deliver up his kingdom to none, nor the rule of his Church, till all things be fulfilled, and the number of his chosen accomplished.

XLVII. *David.*

1. David, beloved, or a man according to God's own heart, 1 Sam. xiii. 14; 1 Kings, xiv. 8.—So was Christ that truly well-beloved of God, in whom his soul was content and well-pleased, Matt. iii. 17.

2. He was a shepherd, 1 Sam. xvii. 15.—So is Christ the true shepherd of our souls, 1 Peter, ii. 25.

3. He pulled the sheep out of the lion's mouth, and the lamb out of the paws of the bear, 1 Sam. xvii. 34, 35.—So hath Christ powerfully delivered his own chosen flock out of the power of Satan and damnation, 1 Cor. xv. 24—28.

4. He was anointed to be King and Ruler of Israel, 1 Sam. xvi. 12—14.—So is Christ with the oil of gladness, to be the Ruler and King of his Church, Heb. i. 8, 9.

5. Between the time of his anointing, and installing in the possession of the kingdom, many troubles and persecutions intervened.—So between the anointing of Christ with the fulness of the Spirit, and his glorious installing in the kingdom of the Father, many afflictions and persecutions, yea, death itself, for our sakes, intervened likewise, Isa. liii.

6. Though he suffered innocently, yet he was meek and merciful to all his persecuting enemies, 1 Sam. xxiv. &c.—So, though Christ suffered without cause, yet he offered grace and mercy, and prayed for his crucifiers, Isa. liii. 12.

7. He was a prophet also in Israel, Acts, ii. 29, 30.—So was Christ that great prophet of his Church, Acts, vii. 37; John, i.

8. He delivered the host of Israel from that great Goliah, whom he killed, although of little account, and with his own sword cut off his head, 1 Sam. xvii. 51.—So hath Christ delivered his Church, which none else could do, from that fearful giant Satan, whom he hath overcome, although contemptible in the eyes of the world, and with his own machinations hath trod down his head, Gen. iii. 15.

9. The Lord honoured him with many and great victories, 1 Sam. xviii.; 2 Sam. xxi.—So likewise did he Christ Jesus over that old serpent, and all our spiritual enemies, 1 Cor. xv.

10. He brought back the ark again, 2 Sam. vi. 12.—So hath Christ Jesus the truth, that lay obscured by the false interpretation of the scribes and pharisees, Matt. v. vi. vii. and hath reduced the Church from the spiritual captivity thereof fully, and from the obscurity of types, to the clear beholding of the bright substance, establishing it in that estate for ever, Heb. ix.

11. Even those that sat at his table, rose up against him, Psal. xli. 9.—So one of Christ's disciples, Judas, who did dip in the platter with him, betrayed him, Matt. xxvi. 23.

12. Lastly, in many prophetical speeches he typified Christ Jesus; as, "Thou wilt not suffer thy Holy One to see corruption;" and "They parted my garments amongst them, and on my vesture did cast lots;" "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" and many such like, as are quoted and set down orderly in the treatise following. All which is compatible with substantial truth, and belongs properly to Christ Jesus alone.

THE DISPARITY.

David was a man of blood: but Christ Jesus was meek and peaceable. David, for that cause, was not suffered to build the temple: but Christ Jesus is the sole and only builder of his holy Church. David's life was tainted with sundry blots; but the life of Christ was altogether spotless.

XLVIII. *Solomon.*

1. Solomon, or Shelomah, peaceable, the son of David, greatly beloved of God, 2 Sam. xii. 24.—So was Christ peaceable, yea, the Prince of Peace itself, called also the Son of David, because he came of him according to the flesh, and who received that testimony from heaven that he was the Lord's well-beloved, "in whom he is well pleased," Matt. iii. 17.

2. He was very wise and rich, yea, above all others therein, 1 Kings, iii. and iv.—So is Christ the very wisdom and full treasure of the riches of the Father, and matchless in both, Col. ii. 3.

3. The queen of Sheba came to see Solomon from afar, and brought gifts unto him, 1 Kings, x.—So came the wise men from the east to see Jesus, and offered gold, myrrh, and incense to him, Matt. ii.

4. The fame of Solomon's speeches and doings spread afar off. — So did the fame of Christ Jesus, his doctrine and miracles, Matt. iv. 23, 24.

5. He built the temple, and dedicated it to the Father, 1 Kings, vi. — So hath Christ built the Church, and consecrated it unto his Father, Gal. iii. 7, 8.

6. He desired that all that should pray within the temple, might be heard, 1 Kings, viii. — So Christ intercedeth, that all that pray in his holy Church, as true members thereof, may be likewise heard, John, xvii.

7. He appointed the several ministers and office-bearers in the temple. — So hath Christ established the several ministerial functions and offices, that should be in his Church, 1 Cor. xii. 4—11.

THE DISPARITY.

Solomon did fall away in the end of his life from that sincerity, especially in God's worship, which he had in the beginning, and therefore procured a heavy punishment on his house after him; but Christ Jesus persevered unto the death, in that perfect obedience that he yielded always to the Father, and therefore procured great blessings on his Church thereby for ever.

XLIX. *Solomon's Temple*, 1 Kings, vi.; *as it was a type of Christ's personal body*, John, ii. 19—21.

1. It was a most glorious edifice, 1 Kings, v. vi. vii. — So was the excellent fabric of the immaculate body of Christ.

2. It was stone without and gold within.— To shew the resplendent glory of divine majesty, veiled in a human and humbled body, Isa. ix. 6, 7.

3. It was full of light through the many windows therein. — So our Saviour was full of heavenly knowledge in the will of God, which he revealed to mankind, John, i. 9.

4. It was carved round about with cherubims, palms, and flowers. — To note the serviceable and ready attendance of the holy angels upon the person of Christ, the palm-trees signifying his triumphant victory over his and our enemies, and the flowers his heavenly, diverse and flourishing graces, Matt. iv.

5. In the seventh year, and harvest month it was accomplished. — To shew not only the perfection of his person, (signified by that perfect number of seven, and ripeness of such a season as harvest,) but also that in the fulness of time, to accomplish God's decree, he should come and be incarnate, Psal. xl. 7, 8.

6. The temple was solemnly consecrated unto the Lord. — So was the person of Christ, by perfect obedience in life and death unto his Father, *Ibid.*

7. There was pleasant music used in the one. —Which signified the heavenly harmony of divine graces to the comfort of his chosen, which should be in this other, Col. ii. 3.

8. In it was the ark, where the glory of God did appear, which glory did fill also the temple. — So in Christ is the full treasure of all true wisdom, knowledge, and grace, and in whom the Godhead personally inhabited, and did replenish likewise this other, Col. i. 19.

9. It was seated on Mount Moriah, and in the midst of Jerusalem it did stand. — So Christ is placed on high, and in the midst of his Church is to be found, Psal. cx.; xlvi. 5.

10. It was not lawful but in the temple to offer sacrifice. — So is not any spiritual sacrifice of ours, but in Christ, and through him, acceptable, Heb. vii.

11. Many presumed in the one, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, yet were destroyed.— So many presume in the verbal profession of Christ, that they believe in him, and are baptized in his name, and yet shall be damned, Matt. vii. 21—23.

THE DISPARITY.

Forty and six years the temple was in building, after it had been destroyed, and cast down by the Babylonians: but within three days the temple of the body of Christ Jesus did arise, after that it had been crucified and destroyed in a manner by the Jews and Romans, John, ii. 19—22.

L. *The Temple, as it was a type of Christ's mystical body, the Church*, 1 Kings, vi.

1. It was of hewn polished stones, and costly.—So is the mystical body of Christ of lively polished stones, even purged and reformed souls, costly and precious in the Lord's sight, Col. i. 18; Psal. xlv. 10—17.

2. In the building of it there was no noise heard.—So, in the building of the Church, the unity of truth, and of the spirit of love, is hereby recommended, without jarring either in opinion or affection. As also, in that the stones were fitted for the work, before they were brought to be built therein; it shews, that before we can think that we are to be counted as stones ready to be builded in that body and temple of the Church, we must be fitted and reformed likewise, Isa. iv. 3.

3. There concurred not only to the building thereof, Solomon and his servants; but also Hiram of Tyrus, and the Sidonians, that did hew the timber unto it.—To shew, that in the building of the Church, Jew and Gentile

should concur: not only the apostles planting and founding the same, but their successors, faithful pastors every where watering it, and building on their ground, 1 Cor. xii.

4. It was overlaid within of fine gold upon the carved cedars.—To shew the beauty of the Church, adorned with diverse gifts, to be inwardly pure and precious, though unseen, and not perceived by the world, Psal. xlv. 13.

5. In the temple were many windows to make the house light.—So in the Church, is the dispensation of many and diverse graces, to make the same bright and glorious, 1 Cor. xii.

6. In the temple were several degrees of galleries or lofts, one above another, and each larger than the other.—To shew the several rooms and places which God hath appointed in his Church, some higher, some lower; apostles, evangelists, doctors, pastors, elders, &c. the same also being signified by the diversity of officers appointed in the temple, *Ibid.*

7. The walls were carved round about with cherubims, palm-trees, and flowers.—To note the protection of the Church of God by the ministry of angels, (though outwardly unseen,) and the peaceable victorious flourishing under the same, Heb. i. 14.

8. In the seventh year, and in the harvest month, it was finished.—So, in the fulness of time, when the great harvest shall be, the number of the elect being accomplished, then shall the Church be wholly in a triumphant company consummated, Rev. xxi.

9. Solomon consecrated the temple unto the Lord.—So hath Christ (that true Prince of Peace) his Church unto his Father, John, xvii.

10. The music that was used in the one—Did signify the joy of the faithful in the other, Isa. iv. 2.

11. In it was the ark of the testimony.—So in the Church was the word of God, and covenant of grace, borne by the Levites of Christ's true pastors, in the preaching and publishing of the same.

12. The glory of the Lord filled the temple.—So doth the glorious presence of God ever fill the other, being amongst his chosen till the end of the world, John, xiv. 16, 17.

13. The Lord promised to hallow this house, and that his eyes and heart, if his people obeyed him, should be there perpetually.—So will the Lord sanctify his Church, and if we obey him constantly, his eye of mercy, and heart of compassion will be upon us eternally, 1 Cor. i. 30.

14. In the porch thereof were set two pillars of brass, Jachin and Boaz, or stability and strength, with lilies and pomegranates carved upon them.—Noting thereby the stability and strength of Christ's Church through him, who is a double pillar unto the same; or the two sacraments of the Church, whereby our faith is strengthened and confirmed unto holiness, and fruitfulness in good works, James, ii.

THE DISPARITY.

The stones of the temple were dead and senseless; but the members of the Church of God are sensible and lively stones. They were polished and hewn by the hand of man, but these are reformed and sanctified by the Spirit of grace. The temple was utterly destroyed and burnt by the enemies of Israel; but the true Church of God can never be so overthrown: yea, the very gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

Note, that some things here are rather for the conveniency of the case compared, than any typical signification therein sought, as hath been said in the epistle hitherto.

LI. *Elisha compared.*

1. Elisha, the health of God.—So is Christ the health and salvation of God truly to all sick and lost souls, Matt. ix. 12.

2. He succeeded Elijah, who anointed him to be after him, 1 Kings, xix. 16.—So Christ succeeded the baptist, (that second Elijah,) who baptized him, to come after him likewise, to baptize with the baptism of the fire and spirit, Mat. iii. 11; Luke, iii. 21, 22.

3. He received the double of the spirit of Elijah, 2 Kings, ii. 9.—So Christ got not only the double, but the full measure of the spirit which John had, and that without measure, John, iii. 34.

4. He cured Naaman of his leprosy, he raised the dead, healed the waters that were poisoned, with few loaves miraculously he fed many, &c. and did many such miracles, 2 Kings ii. iv. v.—So Christ cures our spiritual leprosy by the bathing of his blood, and tempers the waters of affliction to us; fed likewise many thousands with few loaves, raised the dead, and daily raiseth dead souls by the quickening of his grace, and did many more and greater miracles and wonders, Mat. xiv. 13—21.

5. Elisha had an untrue and covetous Gehazi that served him, who therefore was fearfully punished, 2 Kings, v. 27.—So Christ had a false and covetous Judas, who followed him, who therefore also fearfully perished, Matt. xxvii. 3—5.

6. Elisha was called the chariot and horsemen of Israel, 2 Kings, xiii. 14.—So Christ is the chariot whereby we are carried unto heaven, and the sure defence and safeguard of his chosen, against all their enemies, Zech. xiv. 12.

7. He divided the waters of Jordan with

his cloak, 2 Kings, ii. 14. — So hath Christ made a safe way through death by his cross, Heb. ix.; Psal. xxiii.

8. They that mocked Elisha, were fearfully devoured, 2 Kings, ii. 23, 24. — So shall all those that mock Christ Jesus or his messengers, justly be destroyed, 2 Thes. ii. 8, 9.

9. Nothing so secret as could be hid from Elisha, 2 Kings, vi. 8 and 32. — So no secret thought of the heart can be hid from Christ, Matt. ix. 4.

10. A dead body being cast into the sepulchre of Elisha, touching his bones is raised again, 2 Kings, xiii. 21. — So are our dead souls quickened and raised here by the touch of Christ by faith, and so shall our dead bodies also be raised from the grave hereafter by the virtue of his resurrection, who was laid in the grave likewise, Rom. iv. 23—25.

THE DISPARITY.

Elisha was of a severe spirit, as appears in the example of the children who mocked him, and of his servant Gehazi, &c. but Christ was of a most mild and meek spirit, as is evidently to be seen in his patient sufferings of all injuries without revenge; yea, he kissed him who betrayed him, and cured the ear of Malchus who came out against him.

LII. *Daniel, compared.*

1. Daniel, the judgment of God.—So is Christ the judgment and wisdom of the Father, John, i.

2. He was an excellent opener of secrets, Dan. ii. 5.—So was Christ that matchless manifester of heavenly and hid mysteries, *Ibid.* and John, viii. 12.

3. He was made one of the three rulers of the whole kingdom, Dan. v. 29.—So is Christ, with the Father and Holy Ghost, one of the rulers of the kingdom of heaven and earth, with all things that therein are, John, iii. 35.

4. He was preferred by the king, to be above all the other rulers in the whole realm, Dan. vi. 3.—So Christ is by the Father advanced above all powers above or below, Psal. cx.; Eph. i. 20—23.

5. He was envied, innocently accused, taken, condemned, and cast into the lions' den, Dan. vi.—So was Christ Jesus likewise envied causelessly, accused innocently, taken wrongfully, condemned unjustly, and put to death cruelly, Mat. xxvi. and xxvii.

6. The lions had no power to devour him, wherefore he came safely from them again, vi. 22, 23.—So neither hath death power to destroy Christ, nor the grave power to detain him, but gloriously he rose again from both, Psal. xvi. 9—12; Luke, xxiv.

7. His enemies were cast in immediately after his delivery, and were by the lions speedily destroyed, ver. 24. — So were the Jews, after Christ's ascension, by the merciless Romans cruelly devoured; yea, death and the grave, by Christ's resurrection, were swallowed up in victory, Hos. xiii. 14; Dan. ix. 26, 27.

8. He destroyed Bel and the Dragon, and overthrew idolatry, Apocr. — So hath Christ overcome sin and the serpent, and by the preaching of his truth abrogated heathenish idolatrous worship, Gen. iii. 15.

LIII. *Jonah.*

1. Jonah, a dove.—So was Christ the same in nature, meek and humble, Isa. liii.

2. He was the Lord's prophet.—So was Christ Jesus the same, John, i. 18.

3. For the safety of the rest in the ship, he was cast into the sea to drown.—So, for the safety of mankind, Christ was sent into the world to die, Eph. i. 10; Mat. xx. 28.

4. He was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, yet at last came forth, Jonah, i. 17; ii. 10.—So was Christ three days and three nights in the bowels of the earth, yet at last arose, Matt. xii. 40.

LIV. *Joshua*, Zech. iii. 1 — 6.

1. Joshua, a saviour, or the salvation of the Lord. — So is Jesus the same both in name and effect, Mat. i. 21.

2. He was the Lord's high priest. — So is Jesus the High Priest of God unto his chosen Church, Heb. vii.

3. He stood up as a mediator for his people. — So doth Christ for ever for his Church, Heb. viii.

4. Satan resisted him, but altogether in vain, for he was rebuked. — So tempted he Christ, but in vain likewise, for he was overcome; and resisted him in his function by the scribes and pharisees, but prevailed not, Matt. iv. 1—11.

5. Joshua was clothed at first with filthy garments, but thereafter they were taken away, and glorious garments were given unto him: signifying the taking away of his sins, and the clothing of him by the righteousness of Jesus Christ.—So was Christ Jesus himself at first clothed with ignominy, the base rags of our nature, and shape of a servant, wherein he did suffer; having also the filthy garment of our sins put upon him by imputation; but after this his humility, he was brought to exaltation, and clothed not only with perfect righteousness, but with that glory that he had with the Father before the beginning of the world, Phil. ii. 6—11.

6. A diadem was likewise set upon the

head of Joshua. — So was a diadem of glory set upon the head of Jesus, to shew him thereby to be not only the High Priest, but the Prince of his people, Zech. xiv. 9; Heb. ii. 9.

LV. *Zerubbabel*, Haggai, i. and ii.

1. Zerubbabel, a stranger in Babel, or alien from confusion. — So was Christ a stranger in this wicked world, his proper seat being the heavens, and an alien from sin, and eternal confusion, the wages thereof.

2. He is called the elect one of God in a special manner, Hag. ii. 23.—So is Christ Jesus the same most truly and properly.

3. The Lord promiseth to make him as a signet: signifying thereby, that his dignity and glory should be most excellent.—Which only and fully is accomplished in Christ.

4. He was a prince of his people.—So is Christ the only prince of his chosen.

5. He was appointed by God to build the material temple.—So was Christ Jesus to build the spiritual temple.

6. That which he built was as nothing in outward show, in comparison with the first temple; but yet it was more glorious inwardly, in respect of the Lord's filling it with his presence, and giving of his peace therein, Hag. ii. 7, 8, 9. — So the Church which Christ hath built is as nothing in outward show, being base and contemptible in this world, but (like the king's daughter) she is all glorious within, by the spiritual presence of her builder, her head, and husband, Jesus, who, with his presence, gives her also his peace, which the world can neither give, receive, nor take away from her.

7. All nations, and the desire of all nations, shall be moved to come to this temple of the Lord, Hag. ii. 8.—So prefiguring that accomplishment in the conversion of the Gentiles, to the clear faith and true Church of Jesus.

THE

HARMONY OF ALL THE PROPHETS.

I. *His forerunner*, The Baptist.

Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me, &c. Mal. iii. 1.

The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.

Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain.

And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it, Isa. xl. 3, 4, 5.

And thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord, to prepare his ways;

To give knowledge of salvation unto his people, by the remission of their sins,

Through the tender mercy of our God, whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us,

To give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death; to guide our feet into the way of peace, Luke, i. 76—79.

Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord,

And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse, Mal. iv. 5, 6.

And if ye will receive it, this is Elias, (saith Christ) which was to come, Matt. xi. 14.

II. *His own coming or birth.*

There shall come a Star out of Jacob; and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth, Num. xxiv. 17.

O Zion, that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain: O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength, lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God!

Behold, the Lord God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him, Isa. xl. 9, 10.

Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Sion, for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth, shall not make haste, xxviii. 16.

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace; of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, ix. 6, 7.

I will give to Jerusalem one that bringeth good tidings, xli. 27.

And their nobles shall be of themselves, and their governor shall proceed from the midst of them: and I will cause him to draw near, and he shall approach unto me. For who is this that engaged his heart to approach unto me, saith the Lord? Jer. xxx. 21.

In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David, and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land, xxxiii. 15.

Behold, I will bring forth my servant, the Branch.

For behold the stone that I have laid before Joshua, upon one stone shall be seven eyes: behold, I will engrave the graving thereof, saith the Lord of Hosts: and I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day, Zech. iii. 8, 9.

In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness, xiii. 1.

And the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple; even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts.

But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap:

And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness, Mal. iii. 1—3.

And the Redeemer shall come to Sion; and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord, Isaiah, lix. 20.

III. *The time of his coming or birth.*

The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come: and unto him shall the gathering of the people be, Gen. xlix. 10.

Now gather thyself in troops, O daughter of troops, (Jerusalem:) he hath laid siege against us; they shall smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek.

But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, &c. out of thee shall he (then) come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel, Micah, v. 1, 2.

But it shall be one day which shall be known to the Lord, not day nor night, but it shall come to pass that at evening time it shall be light, (that is, there shall be a gloomy time of trouble and subjection; in the end whereof God shall send spiritual comfort to the Jews.)

And it shall be in that day that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem, half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea: in summer and in winter shall it be, Zech. xiv. 7, 8.

Seventy weeks (which was 490 years, till the coming of Christ) are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore, and to build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks; the street shall be built again, and the wall even in troublous times, Dan. ix. 24, 25.

(See the marginal note of the Bible, which explains this count.)

IV. *The place of his birth, and of what tribe he should be of.*

But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.

And he shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God, and they shall abide; for now shall he be great unto the ends of the earth: and this man shall be the peace, Micah, v. 2. 4, 5.

V. *Of what family or stock he should be of.*

And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots;

And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, &c. Isa. xi. 1, 2.

And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people: to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious, ver. 10.

In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land, Jer. xxxiii. 15.

VI. *Who should be his mother.*

Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel: butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, Isa. vii. 14, 15.

For the Lord hath created a new thing in the earth, A woman shall compass a man, Jer. xxxi. 22.

VII. *He is presented to the Lord, and circumcised; as it is written.*

Every male that openeth the womb, shall be called holy to the Lord: and in the eighth day the foreskin of the child's flesh shall be circumcised, Exod. xiii. 2; Lev. xii. 3.

VIII. *He is carried to Egypt after his birth, that it might be fulfilled.*

And called my Son out of Egypt, Hosea, xi. 1.

XI. *A great slaughter of the Bethlehemites' children ensueth thereafter: whereby this prophecy was fulfilled.*

In Rama was a voice heard, mourning and weeping, and great howling; Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they were not, Jer. xxxi. 15.

X. *After his return, he is brought and abides in Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophets.*

He shall be called a Nazarene, Judg. xiii. 5. Being typified there by Samson, Matt. ii. 23.

XI. *He should be God.*

O Sion, that bringest good tidings, &c. say to the cities of Judah, Behold your God, Isa. xl. 9.

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, &c. ix. 6.

Say to them that are of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not; behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompence; he will come and save you.

Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped, xxxv. 4, 5.

And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him, and he will save us, Isa. xxv. 9.

XII. *He should be Man.*

The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent, Gen. iii. 15.

And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, Gen. xii. 3.

I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him: and it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him, Deut. xviii. 18, 19.

And their nobles shall be of themselves, and their governor shall proceed from the midst of them, Jer. xxx. 21.

He is a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief, Isa. liii. 3.

XIII. *He should be both united in one Person.*

And they shall call his name Immanuel: (which is, by interpretation, God with us,) Isa. vii. 14.

XIV. *The Spirit of God should rest upon him: as was visibly seen in his Baptism.*

Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth: I have put my Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles, Isa. xlii. 1.

And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him: the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord;

And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears;

But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked.

And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins, Isa. xi. 2—5.

XV. *His name should be Jesus Christ, or a Saviour anointed by God: and to what end his coming and anointing should be.*

And thou shalt know, that I the Lord am thy Saviour, and thy Redeemer, the mighty one of Jacob, Isa. lx. 16.

I, even I, am the Lord, and beside me there is no Saviour, xliii. 11.

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek: he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound;

To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn;

To appoint unto them that mourn in Sion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness; that they might be called Trees of righteousness, The planting of the Lord, that he might be glorified, Isa. lxi. 1—3.

I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles;

To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house, Isa. xlii. 6, 7.

The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord, and against his Anointed, Psalm ii. 2.

Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows, Psal. xlv. 7.

And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary; for thou hast found favour with God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus, Luke, i. 30, 31.

XVI. *His Kingly Office, and administration thereof.*

1. *Justice.*—He shall sit on the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it; and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth, even for ever: the zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this, Isa. ix. 7.

2. *Power.*—With righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked.

And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins, Isa. xi. 4, 5.

3. *Peace or meekness.*—The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them, &c. ver. 6.

4. *Plenty.*—They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea, ver. 9.

Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch: and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth, Jer. xxiii. 5.

5. *Grace;* 6. *Tranquillity;* and 7. *Righteousness.*—In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness, ver. 6.

He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David:

And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end, Luke, i. 32, 33.

Behold, I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people, Isa. lv. 4.

XVII. *His Priestly Office. What sacrifice he should offer; and for whom he should pray.*

His oblation.—Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief:

When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand, Isaiah, liii. 10.

Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong, because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many, ver. 12.

XVIII. *His Prophetical Office, and pastoral function, abrogating ignorance, and restoring light, &c.*

He hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek, he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound;

To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn, Isa. lxi. 1, 2.

Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped, xxxv. 5.

And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations, xxv. 7.

Moreover, the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun; and the light of the sun shall be seven-fold as the light of seven days in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound, xxx. 26.

The Lord thy God, (saith Moses to Israel,) will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken, Deut. xviii. 15.

He shall feed his flock like a shepherd; he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young, Isa. xl. 11.

And I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David, (meaning Christ, of whom David was a figure,) he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd, Ezek. xxxiv. 23; Hosea, iii. 5.

Thus saith the Lord, In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee: and I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages:

That thou mayest say to the prisoners, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Shew yourselves: they shall feed in the ways, and their pastures shall be in all high places.

They shall not hunger nor thirst; neither shall the heat nor sun smite them: for he that hath mercy on them shall lead them, even by the springs of waters shall he guide them, Isa. xlix. 8, 9, 10.

XIX. *He should be the natural Son of God; and therefore not begotten of man, but conceived of the Holy Ghost.*

I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee, Psalm ii. 7.

Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little: blessed are all they that put their trust in him, ver. 12.

Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet, Dan. ii. 34.

And whosoever shall fall on this stone, shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder, Isa. viii. 14, cited Matt. xxi. 44.

For behold the stone that I have laid before Joshua; upon one stone shall be seven eyes: Behold, I will engrave the graving thereof, saith the Lord of Hosts, Zech. iii. 9.

And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God, Luke, i. 35; Psalm xl. 7.

XX. *His low abasement upon earth.*

I am a worm, and no man: a reproach of men, and despised of the people, Psalm xxii. 6.

For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.

He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and we hid as it were our faces from him: he was despised, and we esteemed him not, Isa. liii. 2, 3.

XXI. *His perfect obedience unto the Father.*

The Lord God hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back, Isa. l. 5.

Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me,

I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart.

I have preached righteousness in the great congregation: lo, I have not refrained my lips, O Lord, thou knowest, &c. Psalm xl. 7, 8, 9.

For I have kept the ways of the Lord, and have not wickedly departed from my God.

For all his judgments were before me, and I did not put away his statutes from me.

I was also upright before him, and I kept myself from mine iniquity.

Therefore hath the Lord recompensed me according to my righteousness, according to the cleanness of my hands in his eyesight, Psal. xviii. 21—24.

Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows, Psal. xlv. 7.

XXII. *His meekness and mercy towards man.*

A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth, Isa. xlii. 3.

XXIII. *His humble behaviour, and riding to Jerusalem on an ass's colt*, Matthew, xxi.

He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street, Isa. xlii. 2.

Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Sion: shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: Behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation: lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass, Zech. ix. 9.

XXIV. *His zealous purging of the Temple.*

For the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up; and the reproaches of them that reproached thee, are fallen upon me, Psalm lxix. 9.

XXV. *The children cry in the Temple, Hosanna to the Son of David, as it is written.*

Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength, Psal. viii. 2.

XXVI. *The time of his suffering.*

And after threescore and two weeks (which is 439 years after the building of the temple at the commandment of Darius) shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself, Dan. ix. 26.

And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week, (till that eternal Sabbath:) and in the midst of the week, (that is, after three years' preaching or thereabout,) he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, (Christ accomplishing and abrogating the same by his death and passion,) &c. ver. 27.

XXVII. *His betrayer Judas a disciple.*

Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me, Psal. xli. 9.

For it was not an enemy that reproached me; then I could have borne it: neither was it he that hated me that did magnify himself against me; then I would have hid myself from him:

But it was thou, a man, mine equal, my guide, and mine acquaintance.

We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company. Psal. lv. 12—14.

And they have rewarded me evil for good: and hatred for my love.

Set thou a wicked man over him; and let Satan stand at his right hand. When he shall be judged, let him be condemned; and let his prayer become sin.

Let his days be few: and let another take his office, Psal. cix. 5—8.

XXVIII. *His exercise in the garden before he was betrayed, and what he suffered there.*

For my love they are my adversaries; but I give myself unto prayer, Psalm cix. 4.

From above hath he sent fire into my bones, Lam. i. 13.

Mine eyes do fail with tears; my bowels are troubled; my liver is poured upon the earth, &c. Lam. ii. 11.

Behold, O Lord, for I am in distress: my bowels are troubled, mine heart is turned within me, for I have grievously rebelled, Lam. i. 20.

I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels, Psal. xxii. 14.

XXIX. *The price for which he was sold, and how it was bestowed.*

So they weighed for my wages (or price) thirty pieces of silver.

And the Lord said unto me, Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price, that I was prized at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord, Zech. xi. 12, 13.

XXX. *The scattering of his disciples when he was betrayed and taken*, Matthew, xxvi.

Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of Hosts: smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered, Zech. xiii. 7.

XXXI. *His preceding sufferings before his crucifying, in scourging, buffeting, spitting, &c.*

I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting, Isa. l. 6.

As many were astonished at thee: his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men; so shall he sprinkle many nations, lii. 14, 15.

XXXII. *How his garments should be parted.*

They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture, Psalm xxii. 18.

XXXIII. *How he should be nailed on a cross.*

They pierced my hands and my feet, Psal. xxii. 16.

And in that he was to redeem us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: it behoved so to be, as it is written,

Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree, Gal. iii. 13; Deut. xxi. 23.

XXXIV. *That he should be crucified between malefactors.*

And he was numbered with the transgressors, Isa. liii. 12.

XXXV. *How he should be mocked and taunted, both in words and gesture.*

All they that see me, laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, He trusted on the Lord, that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighteth in him, Psal. xxii. 7, 8.

I became also a reproach unto them: when they looked upon me, they shaked their heads, Psal. cix. 25.

I was a derision to all my people, and their song all the day, Lam. iii. 14.

XXXVI. *What drink he should get upon the cross.*

They gave me also gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink, Psal. lxix. 21.

XXXVII. *How he should be forsaken of all.*

Reproach hath broken my heart, and I am full of heaviness: and I looked for some to take pity, but there was none; and for comforters, but I found none, Psal. lxix. 20.

For these things I weep, mine eye runneth down with water: because the comforter that should relieve my soul is far from me: my children are desolate, because the enemy prevailed, Lam. i. 16.

XXXVIII. *The last words that he should use.*

Complaining.—My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? Psal. xxii. 1.

Interceding.—And he made intercession for the transgressors, Isa. liii. 12.

Recommending.—Into thine hand, O Lord, I commit my spirit, Psal. xxxi. 5.

XXXIX. *His patience that he should have in all his sufferings.*

He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth, Isa. liii. 7.

Thus I was as a man that heareth not, and in whose mouth are no reproofs.

For in thee, O Lord, do I hope: thou wilt hear, O Lord, my God, Psal. xxxviii. 14, 15.

XL. *For whom he should suffer all these things, and his own innocency therein.*

But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.

All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all, Isa. liii. 5, 6.

And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death, because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth, ver. 9.

XLI. *His legs were not broken, as the others were that were crucified with him, as was foretold.*

Not a bone of him shall be broken, Exod. xii. 46, cited John xix. 36.

XLII. *His side was pierced with a spear, that the Scripture might be fulfilled.*

And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications, and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, Zech. xii. 10.

XLIII. *His burial.*

And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death, Isa. liii. 9.

XLIV. *His resurrection.*

Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth; my flesh also shall rest in hope:

For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.

Thou wilt shew me the path of life: in thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore, Psal. xvi. 9—11.

XLV. *His victory over Satan, death, the grave, and all our enemies.*

The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent, Gen. iii. 15.

And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations.

He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it.

And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him, and he will save us: This is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad, and rejoice in his salvation, Isaiah, xxv. 7—9.

I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes, Hosea, xiii. 14.

XLVI. *His ascension, or exaltation, and sitting at the right hand of the Father.*

Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them, Psalm lxviii. 18.

The stone which the builders refused, is become the head stone of the corner.

This is the Lord's doing, it is marvellous in our eyes, Psalm cxviii. 22, 23.

The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool, Psal. cx. 1.

XLVII. *The destruction of Jerusalem that should ensue shortly after the death and ascension of the Messiah, by Titus the son of Vespasian.*

The Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself; and the people of the prince that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

And for the over-spreading of abominations, he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate, Dan. ix. 26, 27.

XLVIII. *Whereby, how, and who are saved by him.*

And with his stripes we are healed, Isaiah, liii. 5.

As many were astonished at thee, his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men, so shall he sprinkle many nations, lii. 14, 15.

Thou also shalt be saved through the blood of the covenant, Zech. ix. 11.

By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities, Isaiah, liii. 11.

Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else, xlv. 22.

And the Redeemer shall come to Sion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord, lix. 20.

XLIX. *The calling of the Gentiles, and largeness of his dominion thereby, (with the perpetuity thereof,) according to Noah's wish, and the promise made to Abraham,* Genesis, ix. 27; xii. 3.

Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession, Psal. ii. 8.

He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth.

They that dwell in the wilderness, shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust, &c. Psal. lxxii. 8, 9.

Yea, all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him, ver. 11.

I will give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles, Isa. xlii. 6.

And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people: to it shall the Gentiles seek; and his rest shall be glorious, xi. 10.

I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth, xlix. 6.

Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders.

And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, &c. ver. 22, 23.

Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought, lx. 11.

Behold, thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest not; and nations that knew not thee shall run unto thee, because of the Lord thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel; for he hath glorified thee, lv. 5.

I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not: I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name, lxv. 1.

And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him, Dan. vii. 27.

And in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God, Hosea, i. 10.

But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and people shall flow unto it.

And many nations shall come and say, Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, &c. Micah, iv. 1, 2. See Mal. i. 10, 11.

Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, It shall yet come to pass, that there shall come people, and the inhabitants of many cities:

And the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to pray before the Lord, and to seek the Lord of Hosts; I will go also.

Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of Hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord, &c. Zech. viii. 20—22.

And the Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one, xiv. 9.

And in the days of these kings, shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces, and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever, Dan. ii. 44.

Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre, Psal. xlv. 6.

L. *The conversion of the Jews, and what shall precede the same.*

For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, (meaning an oracle delivered between the cherubims,) and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim.

Afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days, Hosea, iii. 4, 5.

In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together, going and weeping: they shall go, and seek the Lord their God.

They shall ask the way to Sion, with their faces thitherward, saying, Come and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten, Jer. l. 4, 5.

Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the coasts of the earth, and with them the blind and the lame, the woman with child, and her that travaileth with child, together: a great company shall return thither.

They shall come with weeping, and with supplications will I lead them: I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters in a straight way, wherein they shall not stumble; for I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born, Jer. xxxi. 8, 9.

And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first born.

In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon, Zech. xii. 10, 11.

Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land: for great shall be the day of Jezreel, Hosea, i. 11.

In that day, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted, &c. Micah, iv. 6.

LI. *The free and plentiful offer of grace to both Jew and Gentile.*

In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness, Zech. xiii. 1.

And it shall be in that day, that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea: in summer and in winter shall it be, xiv. 8.

Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money: come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money, and without price, Isa. lv. 1.

Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David, ver. 3.

LII. *The happy estate of the Church under Christ Jesus in the latter time.*

But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it.

And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

But they shall sit every man under his vine, and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid: for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it, Mic. iv. 1—4.

In that day, saith the Lord, I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted;

And I will make her that halted a remnant; and her that was cast far off, a strong nation; and the Lord shall reign over them in Mount Sion, from henceforth, even for ever, ver. 6, 7.

And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people; and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying.

There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: for the child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner, being an hundred years old, shall be accursed.

And they shall build houses and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them, Isa. lxv. 19—21.

They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble: for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them.

And it shall come to pass, that before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear.

The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock: and dust shall be the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, ver. 23—25.

Look upon Sion, the city of our solemnities: thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down; not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed, neither shall any of the cords thereof be broken:

But there the glorious Lord will be unto us a place of broad rivers and streams; wherein shall go no galley with oars, neither shall gallant ship pass thereby.

For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king; he will save us, xxxiii. 20—22.

Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment.

And a man shall be as an hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place; as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.

And the eyes of them that see shall not be dim; and the ears of them that hear, shall hearken.

The heart also of the rash shall understand knowledge, and the tongue of the stammerers shall be ready to speak plainly.

The vile person shall be no more called liberal, nor the churl said to be bountiful, xxxii. 1—5.

Then judgment shall dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness remain in the fruitful field.

And the work of righteousness shall be peace; the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance for ever.

And my people shall dwell in a peaceable habitation, and in sure dwellings, and in quiet resting-places, &c. ver. 16—18.

He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass, as showers that water the earth;

In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth.

He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth, Psal. lxxii. 6—8.

Yea, all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him, ver. 11.

He shall spare the poor and needy, and shall save the souls of the needy.

He shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence; and precious shall their blood be in his sight, ver. 13, 14.

His name shall endure for ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun; and men shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him blessed, ver. 17.

LIII. *His second coming to judgment, and the resurrection of all flesh to appear before him.*

For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth:

And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God:

Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me, Job, xix. 25—27.

Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence: a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him.

He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people.

Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice.

And the heavens shall declare his righteousness; for God is judge himself, Psal. l. 3—6.

And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince, which standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.

And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever, Dan. xii. 1—3; (2 Esdras, xiv. 35.)

The thanksgiving of a Christian soul for the performance of all these merciful predictions, and the full accomplishing of that great and glorious work of our redemption.

I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels, Isaiah, lxi. 10.

In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old, Isa. lxiii. 9.

And blessed be his glorious name for ever; and let the whole earth be filled with his glory. Amen, and amen, Psal. lxxii. 19.

THE END.

EDINBURGH:
Printed by Andrew Shortrede, Thistle Lane.

THE

AUTHENTICITY, UNCORRUPTED PRESERVATION, AND CREDIBILITY

OF

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY GODFREY LESS,

LATE PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GOTTINGEN, &c.

TRANSLATED FROM THE LAST EDITION OF THE GERMAN

BY ROGER KINGDON, A. M.

OF ST JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK I.

OF THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

PAGE
- Chap. I. — The necessity of this inquiry, 7
- II. — Of the internal traces of authenticity in the New Testament, 8

BOOK II.

THE EXTERNAL OR DECISIVE EVIDENCE FOR THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, NAMELY, THE POSITIVE TESTIMONIES OF WITNESSES IN THE THREE FIRST CENTURIES.

- Chap. I. — Witnesses in the first century, 11
  - Sect. 1. The origin and state of Christianity in the first century, ib.
  - 2. The apostolical fathers, 12
    - 1. Barnabas, ib.
    - 2. Clement of Rome, 13
    - 3. Hermas, 17
    - 4. Ignatius, 18
    - 5. Polycarp, 19
  - 3. Testimonies from works of the first century, which are now lost, 20
- Chap. II. — Witnesses in the second century, 21
  - Sect. 1. State of Christianity in the second and third centuries, ib.
  - Witnesses in the second century,
    - 1. Justin Martyr, 23
    - 2. Tatian, 24
    - 3. Irenæus, ib.
    - 4. Athenagoras, 26
    - 5. Theophilus of Antioch, ib.
    - 6. Clement of Alexandria, 27
    - 7. Tertullian, ib.
  - 2. Evidences from works of the second century, which are now lost, 28
    - 1. Dionysius, ib.
    - 2. Tatian, 29
    - 3. Hegesippus, ib.
    - 4. Melito, ib.
    - 5. Community at Lyons and Vienne, ib.
    - 6. Miltiades, 30
    - 7. Theophilus of Antioch, ib.
    - 8. Pantænus, ib.
    - 9. Clement of Alexandria, ib.
- Chap. III. — Witnesses in the third century, 31
  - Sect. 1. Evidences of Witnesses in the third century, ib.
    - 1. Caius Romanus, ib.
    - 2. Hippolytus Portuensis, ib.
    - 3. Ammonius, 32
    - 4. Julius Africanus, ib.
    - 5. Origen, ib.
  - 2. Information collected by Eusebius from the works of the first three centuries, 33
- Chap. IV. — A summary recapitulation of the evidences mentioned above, 35
- V. — Of the Revelation of Saint John, 37
  - Sect. 1. The contents of the book, ib.
  - 2. The interpretation of the book of Revelation, 38
  - 3. Remarks on its contents, 39
  - 4. Of our common text of the Revelation, 40
  - 5. The opinion of ancient writers on this book, ib.
  - 6. The true value and credit of the book, 44
- Chap. VI. — Conclusions drawn from the above mentioned testimonies, ib.

BOOK III.

THE UNCORRUPTED PRESERVATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PAGE
- Chap. I. — The books extant at present in the New Testament, are the same writings which were originally composed by the authors whose names they bear, 45
  - This is proved —
    - 1. From their contents, ib.
    - 2. Because an universal corruption of these writings was impossible; nor can the least vestige of such a corruption be found in history, 46
    - 3. From the agreement of all the manuscripts, 47
    - 4. From the agreement of the old versions and quotations found in the ecclesiastical fathers, 48

PART II.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK I.

THE AUTHORS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT POSSESS, IN A VERY HIGH DEGREE, ALL THE REQUISITE QUALITIES OF CREDIBLE EVIDENCES, 49

- Sect. 1. They were immediate witnesses, ib.
- 2. They were also competent witnesses, 50
- 3. They were by no means credulous, ib.
- 4. Neither were they fanatics, 51
- 5. They were, on the contrary, men of integrity, 54
- 6. They relate events which happened in their own times, 59
- 7. They appeal to notorious proofs, ib.
- 8. They had nothing to expect but temporal disadvantages, 60
- 9. They suffered for the truth of their narration every thing, even death, and brought many of their contemporaries to the sure conviction of its truth, ib.

BOOK II.

THE WONDERFUL ESTABLISHMENT AND PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY, IS A MOST CONVINCING PROOF OF THE ENTIRE CREDIBILITY OF THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, AND OF THE RELIGION WHICH IT ESTABLISHES.

- Chap. I. — Description of the wonderful propagation of Christianity, 62
  - 1. Christianity spreads itself almost immediately over the whole world, ib.
  - 2. It prevailed without the assistance of any temporal power, ib.
  - 3. Through thirteen poor, inconsiderable, unlearned, and almost unknown men, ib.
  - 4. Amidst the most dangerous internal disturbances and distractions, ib.
  - 5. Under the most cruel external persecutions, and the opposition of the whole world, ib.
  - 6. And although exciting the repugnance of the human heart, 63
- Chap. II. — That the old world was intolerant, 64
  - Sect. 1. Of the Egyptians, Grecians, and Romans, ib.
  - 2. The doctrine of Christianity on this subject, 65
- Chap. III. — Parallel between the propagation of Christianity, and of the religion of Mahomet, 66
- A summary recapitulation, and conclusion of the Credibility of the New Testament, 68

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

The subject of the Work now offered to the Public, in an English translation, is an examination of the following questions:—Whether the books of the New Testament were really written by the persons to whom they are ascribed? Whether they have descended to us perfectly uncorrupted, in all essential matters, as they left the hands of their authors? And, lastly, Whether they contain a narration of events which did actually take place?

That this inquiry is of the greatest consequence, and demands our most impartial attention, will be evident from these considerations:—That if we cannot answer the above questions in the affirmative, then is the Christian religion a cunningly devised fable; but, on the contrary, if, in result of the examination, it should be found that the New Testament is both genuine and authentic,—then it will require but few arguments to shew, that the miracles contained in it are true, that the writers were inspired persons, and that our holy faith is a revelation of the will of God.

On this subject the learned author of the following Work, Dr Less, had himself entertained doubts during many years of his life: for his own private satisfaction he instituted a severe and rigid inquiry: the result is exhibited to the Public in the present treatise; and to himself the consequence was a solid, rational, and satisfactory conviction. The original was put into my hands, during my residence in Germany, by a person of distinguished worth. On perusal, it appeared to me extremely well calculated, from its conciseness, perspicuity, and severity of examination, to produce the same effect on others, and to be of service to the Christian cause; as I cannot conceive it possible for any man, who honestly and impartially seeks after truth, to read it with the attention which the subject demands, without receiving the same conviction which the author himself obtained. This opinion of the original work first led me to form the design of translating it into my native language.

Few are the writers who have expressly treated on the authenticity of the books of the New Testament, and fewer still who have done it in a manner always satisfactory to the reader. Du Pin is miserably defective; and Jones seems to have been anxious rather to shew that certain writings are apocryphal, than to prove that the books of the New Testament are canonical. Indeed, he has passed over all the Epistles and the Apocalypse without paying the least regard to them.

But since his time Dr Lardner has employed immense labour and profound erudition on the same subject: nor do I know any man to whom the Christian world has more obligations than to the author of the *Credibility of the Gospel History*. He appears to have almost exhausted his subject, and to have rendered any subsequent undertaking of a similar nature perfectly unnecessary. Instead of giving my own opinion on the difference between the present treatise and the voluminous work of Lardner, I will lay before the reader the sentiments of the great Michælis, and of the Rev. Herbert Marsh, one of the most accurate theological scholars that any age or country has ever produced. "The best treatises," says Michælis, "upon this subject [the authenticity of the New Testament] are Lardner's *Credibility of the Gospel History*, and Less's *Truth of the Christian Religion*, [the subject of the following sheets.] The former of these works, which has been censured for its prolixity, contains a very large collection of testimonies from the fathers and other ancient writers, and is highly valuable to those who would examine the whole series of evidence for the authenticity of the New Testament. The works of Lardner have been less read than they deserve: every one interested in this inquiry should possess them, were it only for occasional reference, and they are indispensable to a clergyman, who cannot remain indifferent on so important a subject, and whose duty is not only to believe, but to be convinced. The latter of these works is more agreeable to read, because prolixity is avoided, and it is easy to oversee the whole chain of reasoning at a single view. Various testimonies which Lardner had quoted, are omitted by Less, because they were not sufficiently convincing, and he has supplied what Lardner had omitted. Every reader will remark, in perusing this treatise, what I have learnt in frequent conversation with the author, that it is the result of a conscientious, even anxiously conscientious inquiry, which he had instituted for his own private conviction. Doubts on which Lardner never thought, he has felt and proved." Thus far Michælis: and his learned translator has borne his testimony to the value of the present work in a note to the passage just quoted: "It would be impossible," says he, "to give an abridgment of it in these notes, as the author himself is very concise: but the whole deserves to be translated in a separate work." To the testimony of such authorities I will add nothing: that which has obtained the praise of Michælis, and the recommendation of Marsh, needs no farther panegyric.

I have only to say a few words in respect to the translation. It is made from the last edition of the original printed at Gottingen, 1786, and is always, it is hoped, faithful to the sense of the author, and generally as literal as the peculiar idioms of the different languages will allow. The whole work of Dr Less, which is called by the general name of *Geschichte der Religion*, or *History of Religion*, is comprised in three volumes. The first is employed on the history of both Natural and Revealed Religion. In the second, the divine origin of Christianity is proved at large. And the third is occupied with the examination and refutation of objections to the Christian religion.

As the following treatise is taken from the body of a work of such magnitude, which is only divided according to the grand divisions of the subject, I conceived it necessary to alter its form by breaking it into the subdivisions of books, chapters, &c., in order that the connection of one part with another might be more readily perceived, and the whole more easily comprehended. From the same cause I have sometimes omitted a word, a sentence, or even a whole paragraph, which appeared unnecessary in the present inquiry, and had an evident reference to parts of the work unconnected with the subject of these sheets.

In the quotations from the Holy Scriptures, Less has frequently paraphrased the passage, from a desire to convey the sense without retaining the obsolete phraseology of the authorized translation of his country. It was my wish to have always adhered literally to our English version; but, as a translator, I have been obliged, in order to retain my author's argument, to retain the form in which it is conveyed, and have therefore been sometimes compelled to render his paraphrase word for word, when I could not introduce the common version.

I have ventured, in one or two cases, to change the examples adduced by the author for others more familiar to an English reader; these are so unimportant that I do not think it necessary to indicate the particular instances.

However unimportant in point of magnitude may be the present work, yet it contains a large body of information. The subject matter, which, if dilated in the modern fashion, would fill a folio, is here condensed into one small volume. This conciseness has tended to render the style of the original extremely inelegant; and may perhaps have had a similar effect on the translation. To which must be added, that conceiving perspicuity in a work of this kind to be a paramount quality, I have studied to make my book rather lucid than elegant, and have been more anxious that the reader should be convinced by the solidity of the argument, than delighted by the beauty of the expression.

Some time since I had formed an intention of publishing in the English language Dr Less's larger work *On the Truth of the Christian Religion*, and had made no small progress in the translation: that intention I have relinquished for the present; whether at any future period I may renew the design, will depend on causes which are not under my direction.

THE
AUTHENTICITY, UNCORRUPTED PRESERVATION, AND CREDIBILITY
OF
THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PART I.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK I.

OF THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

CHAPTER I.

THE NECESSITY OF THIS INQUIRY.

The faith of Christians is thus distinguished from all the other religions of the world,—It pronounces Jesus to be the Redeemer of men, promised by God, the only cause of their salvation, and asserts his doctrine to be undeniably true. Should there, then, never have existed in the world a person, who, in the time of the Roman Emperor Augustus, was born at Bethlehem, of Mary, a Jewish virgin, and known to his countrymen by the name of Jesus; should this Jesus never have performed any miracles, in order to prove the truth of his doctrines; should he not have arisen from the dead; should he, lastly, have never uttered any true prophecies; then the articles of the Christian faith are without doubt a forgery. But should these facts be incontrovertibly true, then it is equally incontrovertible, that the religion of Christians is also true. The Christian religion, therefore, is founded on facts, and consequently must be proved in the same manner as we prove the truth of other historical subjects.

The evidences which Christians adduce for the truth of these facts, are contained in the books of the New Testament. The authors of these books are the witnesses on whose credit Christians believe that history. If, therefore, the credibility of these authors, and of their writings, can be as strictly proved as the credibility of a Tacitus, Livy, Thuanus, or Burnet, then we must either give up the greatest, most beautiful, and most useful part of human knowledge, the whole of history, together with all its various branches, or we must confess, that the books of the New Testament, in all natural and not miraculous subjects, are worthy of credit.

I acknowledge, that should the credibility of the writers of the New Testament be brought even to the very highest degree of historical certainty, that the historical truth of the miracles they relate would not be thereby proved. An author may be in the highest degree worthy of credit, and yet may sometimes be overcome by the weakness incident to human nature, and relate absurdities, or forged miracles, as undoubted truths. We believe him in general; but if he relate palpable absurdities, sound reason becomes an evidence against him, and her decision is infinitely more to be depended upon, than the credibility of any author whatever. We believe him in general; but if he relate miracles, then his credit alone is not sufficient justly to challenge our assent. The more uncommon an event is, so much more weighty must be the proofs for it. If it be a real miracle, then it demands a perfectly peculiar kind of proof, of which I shall speak, when I treat of the "Truth of the Christian Religion." According to these principles we decide on all historical writings. We acknowledge Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, Tacitus, and Livy, to be perfectly credible authorities. Nevertheless, when they speak of a certain divine vapour which arose from the earth, and instilled into men a perfect knowledge of all futurity; or of a ring around the nose, out of which the devil was driven; or when they inform us, that the statue of Jupiter spoke and perspired; that it rained blood; that the Emperor Vespasian, by a mere touch, gave sight to a blind man; in such cases we claim the privilege of refusing our belief, or at least of entirely passing them over as doubtful.

There are no other rules enabling us to judge of the writings of the New Testament, than those by which we judge of any other historical work. Now we are accustomed to establish the credibility of a book in the following manner:—We first prove the authenticity of the book itself, and then the credibility of its author. Two things belong to the proof of the authenticity; first, that the book was really written by the pretended author; and secondly, that it is come down to us perfectly uncorrupted as it left the hands of its author. In this manner we decide on all historical writings; and men are unanimously agreed, that it is as unreasonable to receive an evidence which cannot be proved in this way, as to reject that which has endured these proofs. A man of accuracy and integrity will never attempt to prove the truth of an event, which is pretended to have happened in the first century, from what are called the writings of Dionysius, the Areopagite: for the name of Dionysius which they bear is forged, and they were not composed until the fifth or sixth centuries. Nor will he, like Whiston, believe any thing on the authority of the larger epistles of Ignatius. Ignatius did indeed write epistles; but whatever exists in the larger, that is not found in the smaller, (and even these appear to be not absolutely free from all interpolation,) is the addition of a more modern hand. Orosius is no credible evidence for the truth of events, which are pretended to have taken place at the birth of Jesus; nor will a critic assert any thing on the credit of Simeon Metaphrastes. The former did not write until the fifth century: and the latter is extremely credulous, and much to be suspected: neither of them, therefore, deserves to be esteemed a credible evidence.

Can, then, the three following propositions be proved:—First, That the New Testament was really written by the pretended contemporaries of Jesus; secondly, That it is come down to us uncorrupted; and thirdly, That the authors of it are evidences of credibility; still we cannot, on their credit alone, prove the truth of the miracles they relate; but thus much will be evident, that Jesus did really preach the doctrine acknowledged by Christians; that he was really born at Bethlehem, taught publicly in Judea, in the reign of Tiberius. In a word, all the events which are natural, and not miraculous, must be considered as incontestably true, on the authority of these evidences alone.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE INTERNAL TRACES OF AUTHENTICITY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

When Lord Bolingbroke,[1] in his *Letters on History*, is pointing out the necessity of this study to a theologian, he reproaches the defenders of Christianity, that they are accustomed to transcribe from each other, and thereby perpetuate the errors which have been inadvertently admitted, or the fallacies which have been purposely contrived. "Abbadie," these are his own words, "says, in his famous book, that the Gospel of Saint Matthew is cited by Clemens, Bishop of Rome, a disciple of the apostles; that Barnabas cites it in his epistle; that Ignatius and Polycarp receive it; and that the same fathers, that give testimony for Matthew, give it likewise for Mark. If the fathers of the first century do mention some passages that are agreeable to what we read in our evangelists, will it follow that these fathers had the same gospels before them? To say so is a manifest abuse of history, and quite inexcusable in writers that knew, or should have known, that these fathers made use of other gospels, wherein such passages might be contained, or they might be preserved in unwritten tradition. Besides which I could almost venture to affirm, that these fathers of the first century do not expressly name the Gospels we have of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John." These assertions, which in some respects are well founded, render it of the greatest importance to every enlightened Christian, carefully to examine the evidence of the ecclesiastical writers of the first centuries on this subject.

In this inquiry we are principally concerned with the period of the three first centuries, that is, from the times of the apostles down to Origen. For he has given us the first perfect catalogue of the Scriptures of the New Testament; and since his time these catalogues or canons, and the evidences for each of the books of the New Testament, are so numerous, that it would be perfectly superfluous to attempt to prove, that since the fourth century, the very same books of the New Testament were held by Christians to be divine, which we at present confess to be such.[2] Moreover, subsequent information is inadequate to establish the authenticity of the Scriptures of the New Testament. It is too recent, and the foregoing centuries were too replete with spurious and forged works, to be capable of instructing us confidently what writings were actually composed by the disciples of Jesus in the first century. But of so much greater consequence to us is the period of the three first centuries; and it is a very great error in the defenders of Christianity, when they, either by contenting themselves merely with the well known evidences of Eusebius, or by producing quotations from the primitive writers, which are perfectly indeterminate, or by accumulating such passages from them as have only a similitude in words and sentiments, bring a suspicion on the whole proof for the authenticity, and consequently also for the divinity, of these books.

---

[1] Letter V. vol. ii. p. 349—351, of the 4to. edition.

[2] These canons are found according to the order of the centuries, in Gerhardi de Mastricht *Canon Ecclesiasticus Scripturæ Sacræ*. The latest and best edition of this work is that of Jena, 1725, in 8vo.

Whoever has been much engaged with the writings of antiquity, its modes of thinking and manners, will instantly perceive, on reading these books, that they are not the work of an impostor, but that they were composed about the first century of the Roman monarchy, just as a connoisseur in the fine arts will immediately see whether a painting, a statue, or a gem, be the production of antiquity, an original, or merely a copy, and of a modern age. In the Scriptures of the New Testament there cannot be discovered the smallest trace of deceit or forgery. On the contrary, the character of the pretended times of their composition, and of their pretended authors, is so deeply impressed on them, that a critic, by a mere perusal, will discover their authenticity.

It must appear remarkable to any one who has ever employed himself in distinguishing the genuine remains of antiquity from the spurious, that in these writings there cannot be found the smallest vestige of a forgery. What are called the *Canones* and *Constituitones Apostolorum*, speak of altars, of the ordination of bishops and priests, of the subjection of the Holy Ghost to the Son. The pretended writings of Dionysius, a member of the Court of Areopagus, refute Nestorian and Anthropomorphitic errors; use the word *ὑποϛασις* in the doctrine of the Trinity; and speak of monks, altars, and liturgies. And, in the same manner, all interpolated writings contain something or other, a custom, a science, an expression, which betrays a later age, and does not escape the eye of the critic. On the contrary, we cannot meet with any thing in the Scriptures of the New Testament, which does in the least degree contradict the pretended character, time, and connection of their authors. And not only this: we discover in them such traces of genuineness as are indeed extremely striking.

The writers of the New Testament are said to have been Jews by birth, and of the Jewish religion; and this is every where visible. The mode of relating their story, so unaffected, and mixed with various superfluous phrases, and trifling collateral circumstances; the numerous allusions to the religious ceremonies of the Jews; the subject matter interwoven with words, phrases, and thoughts of the Old Testament; the numerous parables and allegories; the variety of Hebraic words, constructions, and phrases in the Greek of the New Testament, betray an author to whom the Jewish mode of thinking was quite natural.

They are said to have lived in the first century of the Roman monarchy. This also is easily and every where perceptible. The exact division of the Jewish state; its connection with the Romans; the internal transactions and fermentations which took place in it at the time of the first Roman emperors, are not so properly related by the writer as presupposed as matters of fact, which were universally known at the time when he wrote. The little unimportant, foreign events of the first century, which in the books of the New Testament, and especially in the historical, are touched on only casually and very slightly, in so unstudied and unaffected a manner, evince a writer, to whose memory these facts were still quite recent, and who presupposed that his contemporaries were as well acquainted with them as himself. I shall give examples of this in the course of the work.

They are said to have been immediate witnesses of their narratives, or to have themselves seen and heard what they relate. Even this circumstance is every where clearly discoverable. They relate with the confidence of men who are convinced that their readers already know that they themselves saw and experienced all, and that their assertions may therefore be considered as proofs. They relate, without mentioning the eras of their history, or carefully characterizing the person of whom they make mention: in short, like men who wrote for readers that were their contemporaries, that lived at the very time in which their history happened, and knew, or might easily have known, the persons themselves.

They are said to have been all, except one, unlearned men. And who does not remark in the writings of Saint Matthew, Saint Mark, Saint Luke, Saint John, Saint Peter, Saint James, and Saint Jude, that they were composed by persons who were indeed perfectly certain of the facts they relate; possessed also of sound judgment, and in part of excellent natural talents, yet totally devoid of learning, and what is properly called science? We find in their works no profound inferences; no refutations which betray subtilty; no expression or similies taken from the walks of science; no acquired knowledge of the world. In every part the tone of an honest historian is perceptible, but of one to whom it never occurred to argue on his narrative as a philosopher. Compare their writings with those of Saint Paul. If we even put out of the question the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is replete with Jewish learning; yet what profound inferences are drawn in the Epistle to the Romans?[4] What a variety of fine knowledge, and how much adroitness in defending himself with delicacy and subtilty against the accusations of his enemies, are betrayed in the Epistles to the Corinthians? With what acuteness does he oppose the doctrine of the necessity of circumcision, and of adherence to the Mosaic law, in the Epistle to the Galatians? (ch. iii. iv. v.) The Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians, contain a variety of similies taken from profane knowledge; allusions to foreign customs; a luxuriance of ideas; pathetic and strong refutations of accusations.[4] The Epistles to Timothy and Titus shew, in particular, a mind which, from experience and philosophic observation of the world, had obtained considerable legislative knowledge. And the Epistle to Philemon has almost, if I may be allowed to say it, the style of courtly urbanity.

If, therefore, we knew nothing of the real authors of these books, and were to form our judgment of them only from what we discover internally, we should suppose that they were written by native Jews, during the first century, and by immediate witnesses, and that only one of them was a scholar. This matter deserves a more ample inquiry.

The Scriptures of the New Testament are composed in the Greek language. This agrees very accurately with the accounts we have of their authors, and of the time and design of their composition. The Greek language was at that period, in the first century of the Roman monarchy, and had been since Alexander the Great, a kind of universal language, just as the French is at present. It was understood and spoken by Greeks, by Romans, and by Jews. The greater part of the Christians also, especially of those to whom the epistles of the New Testament are addressed, would not have comprehended them so universally in any other language. At Corinth, Thessalonica, Colosse, and in Galatia, scarcely was another language understood. Besides the Latin and Aramæan tongues, the Greek also was understood at Rome, and by the Jews in Palestine.

The Greek, in which the New Testament is written, is not pure and elegant Greek, such as was written by Plato, Xenophon, Polybius, or Plutarch; but is intermixed with many Hebraic significations, phrases, and constructions. It resembles pure classical Greek as much, probably, as the French or German, written or spoken by a native Englishman, which must be constantly mixed with some Anglicisms, resembles the languages of Dresden or of Paris. This is a very striking mark of the authenticity of these writings. Had the Greek of the New Testament been pure, elegant, classical, it would be evident that the writers were either native Greeks, or scholars who had studied Greek; as the writings of Philo or Flavius Josephus betray the scholar. But since we find it intermixed with many peculiarities belonging exclusively to the Hebrew or Chaldee, and Syriac, (the two languages spoken in common life by the Jews of Palestine,) it is evident, from this Hebraic Greek, that the writers were unlearned, and Jews by birth.

The Scriptures of the New Testament are composed in a style which very evidently betrays that their authors were born and educated in the Jewish religion. We find in them constant allusions to offerings, priests, the temple, articles of dress, and other parts of the Jewish divine service. The sentiments of the Old Testament are rather interwoven into the body of them, than quoted. To make Jesus a sin-offering; to sprinkle with the blood of Jesus; to be born again; to be a temple of God: who does not recognize the Jew in these expressions? When, in the Epistle to the Romans, (viii. 36.) the then existing sufferings and persecutions of the Christians are described in the words of the forty-fourth Psalm—"As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter:" when the murder of the infants at Bethlehem (Matth. ii. 17, 18,) is told also in the language of Jeremiah—"In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted:" when the writer of the Epistle to the Romans (xv. 20, 21) expresses the common sentiment, that he taught Christianity in no place where another had already taught before him, with a passage from the Old Testament—"I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named—but as it is written, To whom he was not spoken of, they shall see; and they that have not heard, shall understand." What attentive reader will not discern from such constant and unsolicited accommodations of the phraseology of the Old Testament, a writer to whom the religious language of the Jews was, as it were, a mother-tongue?

The Scriptures of the New Testament are all, except those which bear the name of Saint Paul, very evidently written in a style totally devoid of all cultivation, and with the simplicity of unlearned men. We do not find in them any profound inferences, acute refutations, studied knowledge of the world, or any expressions or comparisons taken from astronomy, physics, anatomy, poesy, archi-

---

[3] Particularly v. 9.

[4] For example, Eph. ii. 20—22; iii. 14—19; iv. 9, 10; v. 3; vi. 10—17. Philip. ii. 17. Coloss. ii. 14—18. 1 Thess. iv. 13—18, &c.

tecture, or, indeed, from any of the arts or sciences. On the contrary, the writers relate, teach, exhort, exactly as men of sound understanding and good principles, but devoid of any cultivation or learning, would relate, teach, and exhort. Common expressions of common life; various repetitions, and circumstances perfectly superfluous; a want of strict connection and method; a faulty construction; these constitute the language of men, whose intellectual powers may be sound, indeed, but entirely uncultivated.

Not less worthy of remark is the accuracy of many individual circumstances of their narrative. Jesus, they say, was born under the Roman Emperor Augustus, began his ministry in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and was put to death about three years and a half afterwards; that on the feast of the Passover, Pilate, a Roman governor, condemned him to death; that Saint Paul defended himself before the Roman governors, Festus and Felix, before the Jewish King Agrippa, &c. An impostor would not write so circumstantially.

There are, moreover, certain historical circumstances respecting the political and religious constitutions of the world mentioned in the Scriptures of the New Testament, which point out incontestably the time when they were written. Palestine is divided into three provinces—Judea, Samaria, and Galilee. This country at that time is subject to the Romans, but had been heretofore ruled by its own kings; the Jews have not the absolute power of life and death; at Jerusalem is a Roman governor. The nation is discontented with the Roman sovereignty, refuses to pay tribute, and is inclined to revolt. Two religious sects have the principal sway among them, namely, the Pharisees and the Sadducees; the former, who teach a mechanical religion, deceive and tyrannize over the people, and yet are almost idolized by them; the latter, who adopt an Epicurean philosophy, are strongly supported by the principal characters of the nation. The temple of Jerusalem is still standing, and is annually visited by a great number of the Jews who are scattered abroad in different parts of the world. These, and similar circumstances, are rather presupposed as universally known, than related by the authors of these writings; and they agree most exactly with the condition of the Jews, and the Roman empire, in the first century of the Roman monarchy. More will be said on this subject hereafter, in the inquiry into the credibility of these writers.

BOOK II.

THE EXTERNAL OR DECISIVE EVIDENCE FOR THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, NAMELY, THE POSITIVE TESTIMONIES OF WITNESSES IN THE THREE FIRST CENTURIES.

CHAPTER I.

WITNESSES IN THE FIRST CENTURY.

NOTWITHSTANDING what has been said above, I confess that it is not absolutely impossible but that a man of very great talents and extensive learning might, as it were, absolutely forget himself; might for a time lay aside his natural modes of thinking and manners, and change himself into a perfectly different person. But the testimonies of the oldest and most credible writers place it beyond all doubt, that the books of our New Testament were written by the pretended authors, Saint Matthew, Saint Mark, Saint Luke, Saint John, Saint Paul, Saint Peter, Saint James, and Saint Jude, and at the pretended times.

In this proof I shall quote such passages only, wherein these writers appeal either by name, or expressly, to those books; and honestly confess the doubts which, to an impartial searcher after truth, will occur in this inquiry. I shall thus hinder the enemies of Christianity from using that argument which Bolingbroke has brought against it;[1] and if in this examination nothing be overcharged; but, on the contrary, if the love of truth, and the strictest severity of inquiry, be every where discoverable, additional weight, I trust, will be given to my proof.

SECT. I.—THE ORIGIN AND STATE OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE FIRST CENTURY.

Jesus, the Christ, was born in the forty-first year of the government of the Roman Emperor Augustus, consequently four years earlier than the commonly received computation, or one thousand eight hundred and eight years before the present time: he taught personally during three years and a half in Judea, Samaria, and Galilee; and at his death left one hundred and fifty followers of his religion, who were all persons of low birth, and entirely destitute of that consequence which learning or temporal greatness can bestow, (Acts, i.) About seven weeks after his death, the twelve men, who had been his most intimate friends, began to preach his religion in the world. On the first day of their preaching, they established in Jerusalem a community of Christians, consisting of more than three thousand persons,

---

[1] See above, p. 8.

(Acts, ii.) And in less than sixty years there existed numerous and flourishing communities of Christians in Asia, as well in the eastern parts towards Persia and India, on the Ganges, as in the western; in Africa, at Alexandria and other places; and in Europe, in Macedonia, Greece, nay, even at Rome, at that time the metropolis of the world. Thus, at the end of the first century, that small unknown fountain, the parent community at Jerusalem, was become a stream, which had spread itself over every part of the known globe.

These Christian communities formed and supported themselves, notwithstanding the opposition of the whole then existing world. The Jews arose against their members, who taught the abolition of that law which they almost idolized, and represented him whom they had crucified as the Teacher and Saviour of the world. They were then, as at present, dispersed over all the regions of the known earth; and wherever the Christians came, there they found powerful, enraged, and cruel enemies. To complete their misery, the Emperor Nero declared himself also against them, and put many of them to death by means the most terrible. Thus oppressed and persecuted on all sides, they could neither confess and practise their religion openly, nor establish any external union among themselves; but every separate community was necessitated to endeavour to govern and to support itself in the best manner it was able. Even in this infant state of Christianity, there arose a formal schism among themselves: the disciples, who had been formerly Jews, insisted on retaining their paternal law, and mixed with Christianity the ceremonies of Judaism; while the Gentile converts considered the abolition of the law of Moses to be an essential article of the new religion, and would be guided by the doctrine of Jesus Christ alone, (Acts, xv.; Rom. xiv.)

SECT. II.—THE APOSTOLICAL FATHERS.

This want of external union was supplied in a certain degree by different writings, circulated among them by their teachers, of which the greater part is now lost. Only five works, which make pretensions to that early age, are come down to us; and these bear the names of five men, at that time very celebrated, Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp. They are called apostolical fathers,[1] because they were the immediate disciples of the apostles. Their high antiquity, and still more their perfect acquaintance with the apostles, render them particularly important to us in our present inquiry.

1. *Barnabas.*

Barnabas was appointed, in conjunction with Saint Paul, the most eminent of the first preachers of Christianity, to publish the religion of Christ among the Gentiles, after they had made many thousand converts among the Jews and Samaritans,[1] (Acts, xiii. 2, 3;) and is not only placed on a perfect equality with him,[2] but is also expressly styled an apostle.[3] He left behind him an epistle, which, according to Clement of Alexandria,[4] Origen,[5] Eusebius,[6] and Jerome,[7] was held in the greatest esteem by the ancients. But whether the work, which we now have under this name,[8] be the very same which Barnabas wrote, and the above mentioned men read, is here unimportant, since it quotes, as we shall see hereafter, not a single passage of the New Testament. It contains, indeed, now the same passages which Clement and Origen have cited from it. But the unnatural mode of interpretation, (known by the name of mystical,) which prevails in it; the fables of the Hyæna, &c. which the author believed; and the assertion that the world would be destroyed in its six thousandth year, which is directly contradictory to the assurances of the New Testament, that the time when it should take place was perfectly unknown, make it certain, that this epistle was not written by that Barnabas, who was an apostle. Nevertheless, the most learned in ancient history are agreed, that it was composed not later than the second century.[9] And we may allow thus much to the testimonies of the primitive writers, that it was written by a Christian teacher, of the name of Barnabas.

---

[1] The most complete and accurate edition of these works is that which was edited by John Baptist Cotelier, under the title, "S. S. Patrum, qui temporibus Apostolorum floruerunt, Barnabæ, Clementis, Hermæ, Ignatii, Polycarpi, opera vera et supposititia. Una cum Clementis, Ignatii, Polycarpi Actis atque Martyriis;" to which he has added very learned annotations and dissertations. The last and best edition is that of Amsterdam, 1724, 2 vols. folio, published under the inspection of John Le Clerc. Besides the annotations of the editor, it contains a variety of new and important additions, which are mentioned in the title. Le Clerc himself has pointed out the advantages of this edition in the "Biblioth. Ancienne et Mod." tom. xxi. part ii. p. 237, seq. An useful abridgment of these writings is to be found in Rösler's "Library of the Ecclesiastical Fathers."

[2] Acts, xiii. 2, 3, 46, 47; 1 Cor. ix. 4—7.

[3] Acts, xiv. 14. Compare verse 4.

[4] Stromata, lib. ii. cap. 20, p. 490. Lib. v. cap. 8, p. 677; cap. 10, pp. 683, 684. Potter's edit. Oxford, 715 fol. In these places Clement cites whole passages from the epistle of Barnabas, which are likewise found in that which we have at present.

[5] De Principiis, lib. iii. cap. 4. p. 140, and contra Celsum, lib. i. cap. 63, p. 378. Charles de la Rue, and Charles Vincent De la Rue, have edited at Paris all the genuine works of Origen, which are still extant, 1733—1759, 4 vols. folio. The passages pointed out above are in tom. i. For an account of this edition of Origen, see Ernesti Theol. Biblioth. vol. vii. p. 371.

[6] Histor. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. 13, 14, pp. 272, 273, vol. i. edit. Gulielmi Reading, who has edited together the Ecclesiastical Histories of Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Evagrius, Philostorgius, and Theodorus. Cambridge, 720, 3 vol. folio.

[7] De Vir. illustr. cap. 6.

[8] See Coteler. Patr. Apostolic. vol. i. p. 15—66.

[9] See Rösler's "Library of the Ecclesiastical Fathers," i. 1.

The principal design of this epistle, is to inculcate the proposition which Saint Paul in his writings so often repeats, and labours so anxiously to prove, namely, that Christians are free from all obligation to the law of Moses. But the author no where refers to this apostle. Saint Paul had already at that time written all his epistles: he composed the last (the Second to Timothy) during his second imprisonment at Rome, in the year of Christ sixty-seven; and Barnabas wrote his in the year seventy. They could not have been unknown to him who was the fellow-apostle and assistant of Saint Paul. This is another argument which tends to prove that this epistle, even if composed by a certain Barnabas, did not come from the celebrated apostle of that name.

To him who reads this epistle without any intention of producing testimonies from it in support of the Scriptures of the New Testament, scarcely any will be perceptible. What might be produced with the greatest appearance of probability, are two passages which have been generally brought forward as an evidence for the Gospel of Saint Matthew.[10] Barnabas is speaking in the seventh chapter of the sufferings of Christ, and delivers this as one of his sayings:—"They who will see me and obtain my kingdom, must receive me with many sufferings and afflictions."[11] And in the fourth chapter he introduces, "Many are called, but few chosen," as the declaration of certain divine Scriptures. For he makes use of a phrase which was commonly employed by the Jews when they quoted their sacred books, "It is written, Let us beware," says he,[12] "lest it should happen to us, as it is written, There are many called, few chosen."

These passages, it is true, exist in the same, or in very similar words, in the Gospel of Saint Matthew. But our author does not point out, by a single word, by whom those expressions were written, or where they are to be found. The first passage does not even prove that the declaration of Christ alluded to, had been taken from any written information. He might, with equal probability, have received it from the oral narration of the apostles. And with respect to the second, I find no trace that Barnabas means here expressly the Gospel of Saint Matthew. If a person, for example, should read in Plutarch—"We find it related, that the letter of Marcellus, on being received at Rome, did not alleviate the sorrow of the Romans, but rather instilled more terror into them;"[13] he would conclude from this passage, "that in the time of Plutarch, credible documents concerning the affairs of the Romans somewhere existed;" but he would not be inclined to prove from it, that Livy had written a Roman history.

If we cast our eyes on the catalogue of scriptural passages, which the apostolical fathers are said to have quoted, in the second volume of Cotelerius, and then reflect that their genuine remains are extremely short, we shall be induced to conclude, that these authors have done nothing else than copy the Bible. Lardner, indeed, is more rigid in the selection of these testimonies; yet the greater part of the passages which he has quoted are in no respect convincing. I will not delay the reader with the consideration of the other testimonies,[14] as I have shewn by the two passages which are generally dwelt upon as of the greatest weight, that Barnabas cannot be placed in the number of evidences for the authenticity of the New Testament.

2. *Clement of Rome.*

Under the name of Clement, who was Bishop of Rome, and an assistant of the Apostle Saint Paul, (Philip. iv. 3,) we have different writings; but of these only the two epistles to the Christian community at Corinth can offer any pretension to this title.

Of the second epistle, as it is called, there is only a fragment remaining,[1] which, nevertheless, exhibits pretty evident marks of forgery. Irenæus[2] was acquainted with only one epistle of Clement, and from this he has quoted. Eusebius[3] was indeed informed of this second epistle; but he rejects it, because he cannot discover any traces of it among the ancients. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, in the second century, mentions only one epistle; and both Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, have quoted the first, but never noticed the second, as has been remarked by Grabe.[4] The tenor itself of this fragment betrays, that it is not the work of Clement: for it cites the Gospels often, and by name, which is universally contrary to the custom of the genuine epistle.[5]

---

[10] See Lardner's *Credibility*, vol. ii. p. 14, 15, of the edition of his works published in 1788.

[11] *Ὀυτω, φησιν, ὁι ϑελοντες με ιδειν ϰαι ἁψασθαι μου της βασιλειας, οφειλουσι ϑλιϐεντες ϰαι ϖαθοντες λαϐειν με.*—Cotel. p. 24.

[12] Almost the first five chapters are wanting in the original. In the old Latin version the passage stand thus, p. 60:—"Adtendamus ergo, ne forte, sicut scriptum est, Multi vocati, pauci electi, inveniamur."

[13] This passage is actually found in the above mentioned author, in his life of Marcellus, *Vitar. Parall.* vol. ii. p. 273. edit. London, 729. in v. vol. 4to. He is speaking of a letter, in which the Proconsul comforts the Romans after a severe defeat which they had suffered from Hannibal, in this manner:—"For he himself was on his march to drive Hannibal out of the country,—*Kαι ταυτα μεν*, (continues Plutarch,) *ὁ Λιϐιος φησιν αναγνωσθεντα τα γϱαμματα μη της λυπης αφελειν αλλα τῳ φοϐῳ ϖϱοσθειναι.*"

[14] Give to every one that asketh thee"—*Παντι αιτουντι σε διδου*, says Barnabas, ch. 19. It is pretended, that this is a proof of his having read the Gospel of Saint Matthew, because the same command is found in it, ch. v. 42. Dr Lardner himself perceives the weakness of this proof; and therefore says, p. 16, "It may be questioned, whether he refers at all to any written gospel."

[1] See Coteler. vol. i. 185—189. John Lewis Frey also has published an accurate edition of the works of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, (Basel. 1742, 8vo.) which I shall use for the purpose of quotation in the following work, on account of its conveniency. What remains of that which is called the second epistle, stands pp. 88—103.

[2] Adversus hæreses, lib. iii. cap. 3, § 3, p. 176, of the edition which was published at Paris, by Renatus Massuet, 1710, fol.

[3] Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. cap. 38. p. 134—*ὁτι μη τους αϱχαιους αυτῃ ϰεχϱημενους ισμεν.*

But the testimonies of the ancients, for what is called the first epistle, are much more numerous and complete.[6] Besides the passages quoted above, we find in Eusebius, in two different places, very ample information concerning it. In the third book of the Ecclesiastical History, chap. xvi.[7] he says, "Of this Clement we have an important and excellent epistle, which is universally received as genuine. He wrote it in the name of the community at Rome to that at Corinth, in which great dissentions at that time existed. This epistle is read, as we know, agreeably to an old custom, in most of the churches. And that such dissentions did actually at that time exist at Corinth, Hegesippus is an incontrovertible evidence." The epistle, then, which the ancients held to be a genuine work of the Roman Clement, was written in the name of the community at Rome to the Christians at Corinth, on account of some dissentions which had arisen among them. In the thirty-eighth chapter of the same book, he points out the contents of that epistle more amply. "In this epistle," says he,[8] "Clement uses many sentiments taken from the epistle to the Hebrews; he even quotes some word for word: and hence it is manifest, that that epistle (to the Hebrews) is not a modern composition, but in all probability has been justly placed among the writings of the Apostle Saint Paul. This epistle which Saint Paul wrote to the Hebrews in their mother tongue, was translated, as some assert, by the Evangelist Saint Luke; or, according to the opinion of others, by this very Clement; and the latter supposition is the more probable, because the epistle of Clement, and that to the Hebrews, are written in a similar style, and the sentiments in both works tolerably well harmonize together."

The epistle which we still possess agrees accurately with this description. It is written in the name of the community at Rome to the Christians at Corinth, and to dissuade them from dissentions and factions, and particularly from an opposition to their presbyters or teachers. The importance and excellence which Eusebius, and the force which Irenæus, in the above mentioned passage, saw in it, must be ascribed to that inclination of the ancients to consider every thing as beautiful, excellent, and forcible, which came from a venerable teacher. The epistle, judged impartially, is written in a tedious style; the author repeats the same subject, probably ten times, without giving it additional force, is rich in unmeaning epithets, wrests scriptural passages to his purpose, and often extends a matter too far, in order to deduce from it an argument which he supposed good and edifying. Notwithstanding these defects, it is one of the most valuable remains of antiquity. Even its great age makes it respectable; for at the latest it was composed in the last ten years of the first century; most probably about the year 96.[9] The credit of its author, and particularly the circumstance of its having been written in the name of an entire and very considerable community, add extraordinary weight to its testimony. It thus becomes a public document, and contains, not the evidence of a private individual, but of the whole Church at Rome.

We must therefore greatly regret, that it now appears neither sufficiently correct nor perfect. Only a single manuscript of it is come down to us. In this some leaves are wanting; and this defect appears to be in that very part which regards the information on the scriptural books. For in all probability that is wanting which Eusebius, in the above-mentioned passage,[10] and Irenæus, *Adv. Hœr.*[11] have quoted from it. Eusebius says, that Clement in this epistle, had adopted many sentiments of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and even transcribed some passages. The former are found indeed in the epistle, which still exists, but not the latter: unless we suppose that the words of Eusebius are not to be taken in their most literal meaning. But Irenæus, in proof of the antiquity of the then prevailing doctrine, appeals to this epistle of Clement. "In it," these are his words, "he delivers the doctrine which he had very lately received from the apostles; namely, that there is one Almighty God, the Creator of heaven and earth; who formed man, brought in the deluge, called Abraham, conducted the Jewish people out of Egypt, spake to Moses, gave the law, and sent the prophets; who has prepared fire for the devil and his angels; that this God is declared by the Church to be the Father of Jesus Christ, every one who chooses may see himself from this epistle."[12] All this also is wanting in the epistle which has descended to us. Irenæus does not indeed positively assert, (as Mill on Matth. xxv. 41, appears to adopt,) that Clement had taken that doctrine from the apostolical writings; he only says, that he had received it from the apostles. Nevertheless, his information still proves, that as early as the first century the very same system, in respect to the above mentioned points, was adopted by the Christians, which we find in our present Scriptures of the New Testament. Perhaps Clement had been more copious on this subject, which Irenæus has only quoted in the form of extracts. If this be the case, the loss is of still greater moment.

---

[4] In the Spicileg. Patrum et hæreticorum Seculi, 1—3, which was published at Oxford, 1698 and 1700, in 2 vols. in 8vo. Vol. i. p. 266—269.

[5] See Lardner's *Credibility*, vol. ii. p. 49.—The same circumstance makes me suspect the genuineness of the two Syriac epistles, which Wetstein has published at the end of his Greek Testament, and defended as genuine. But the silence of antiquity, and the recommendation of celibacy found therein, compel us absolutely to reject them.

[6] It stands in Cotelerius, vol. i. p. 145—181, and in Frey, p. 1—78.

[7] Pp. 107, 108.

[8] P. 134.

[9] Formerly I was of the usual opinion, that this epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. But Lardner has produced arguments, which appear to me incontrovertible, that it must be ascribed to the year 96.—*Credibility*, vol. ii. p. 23—28.

[10] B. iii. ch. 38.

[11] Lib. iii. cap. 3. § 3. p. 176.

Clement in this epistle appeals by name to an Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians, in which he speaks of factions among them; one of which declared Peter, another Apollos, and a third Paul for their head.[13] In order to recommend unity and universal love to the Corinthians, he uses a similitude. "Consider," says he,[14] "our bodies. The head is nothing without the feet, so neither the feet without the head. Even the most inconsiderable members are very necessary and useful to the whole body. They all harmonize with, and are subject to, one another, for the preservation of the whole." Saint Paul uses (1 Cor. xii. 12—26) the very same similitude for the very same purpose.—In the forty-sixth chap. (p. 69,) he exhorts them to unity and love, "because they would otherwise lacerate the members of Christ, and tear them from one another; and would rage against their own bodies, and most senselessly forget, that we are members one of another." Saint Paul also (1 Cor. xii. 27) has employed the same argument.—He makes[15] a representation of charity, which is taken almost entirely from 1 Cor. xiii. "Charity covers a multitude of sins. It undertakes all work, it bears all with patience. In charity there is no meanness, no pride. Charity does all things with unity. Through charity the chosen of God are made perfect."—Thus much, then, is unquestionable from the evidence of Clement, that the First Epistle to the Corinthians was actually written by the Apostle Paul, in the first century.

In the thirty-sixth chapter,[16] Clement makes the very same comparison between Christ and the angels, and uses the very same arguments to prove his divinity, as are found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, (chap. i. 3—13.) The whole passage deserves to be submitted to the reader, that he may himself judge of its concordance with the above mentioned part of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Clement had before said of Jesus, That he alone was the High Priest, through whom God would lead us to the enjoyment of immortal wisdom; "who," he continues, "is the brightness of his Majesty, (*απαυγασμα της μεγαλωσυνης αυτου*,) and by so much greater than the angels, as he has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For so it is written, (Psalm civ. 4,) Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But of his Son, thus said the Lord, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the whole earth (*τα περατα της γης*) for thy possession. And again he saith unto him, Sit on my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool."—However accurately this passage may harmonize with the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, yet I do not pretend to draw a conclusion from it for the authenticity of that epistle. Clement might have derived all these expressions concerning Christ, and these proofs, from the oral information of an apostle. If the authenticity of the Epistle to the Hebrews be not yet determined, (which in this place must necessarily be the case,) then it is equally possible that the author of this epistle copied from Clement, as that the latter copied from the former.

For the same reasons I must judge in a similar manner of the passages which nearly resemble those in our present Gospels of Saint Matthew, Saint Mark, and Saint Luke. In the thirteenth chapter[17] he exhorts the Corinthians to forbearance and brotherly kindness in these words,—"Let us especially remember the commands of the Lord Jesus, for thus he said, Be merciful, so shall ye find mercy. Forgive, so shall it be forgiven unto you. As you do, so shall it be done unto you. As you give, so shall it be given unto you. As you judge, so shall you be judged. As you shew kindness, so shall kindness be shewn unto you. With what measure you mete, with the same it shall be measured unto you." Similar commands of Jesus actually exist in Matt. vii.

---

[12] The Five Books against Heresies, by Irenæus, are extant at present, except a few fragments, preserved by Greek ecclesiastical writers, only in an ancient Latin version. In the passage quoted above, the translator uses the word *Scriptura*—"Ex ipsa *Scriptura*, qui velint, discere possunt."—Probably, therefore, the word in the original was *γραφη*. But the translator, in the section just preceding, which Eusebius has preserved in the Greek, having rendered the same word by *Epistle*, ought also to have translated it in the same manner here; *ἐπεστειλεν ἡ εν Ῥωμη εκκλησια γραφην ἱκανωτατην τοις Κορινθιοις*, he translates, "Scripsit, quæ est Romæ, ecclesia, potentissimas *literas* Corinthiis." This remark proves how void of foundation is the accusation which is made by the enemies of Christianity, that Irenæus in this place pronounces the epistle of Clement to be (*Scriptura*) a divine Scripture.

[13] Ch. xlvii. p. 70.—"Look into the Epistle of Saint Paul the Apostle. What has he there written to you in the very beginning, in the beginning of Christianity?" (Thus I render the words, *εν αρχῃ 'Ευαγγελιου*, which phrase is commonly used in this sense by the ecclesiastical writers. This must not therefore be understood of a gospel written by Saint Paul; which is also evident from the context.)—"Through the instigation of the Spirit, he admonishes you concerning himself, and Peter, and Apollos, because that even then you did form parties."

[14] Ch. xxxvii. p. 57.

[15] Ch. xlix. p. 73.

[16] Pages 55, 56.

[17] Page 20.

1, and Luke, vi. 36—38. But Clement does not once affirm in this passage, that he derived them from any written information. He, and also the Corinthians to whom he wrote, might have received them orally from the Apostles. In the same manner he reminds them[18] of another precept of Jesus. "Remember the words of Jesus, who said, Wo to that man; it were better for him that he had never been born, than that he should offend one of my elect. It were better for him that a millstone should be fastened to him, and that he should be drowned in the sea, than he should offend one of my little ones." This agrees almost verbatim with the discourse of Jesus, in Matt. xviii. 6; Mark, ix. 42; Luke xvii. 1, 2. But it does not therefore follow, that the passages were taken from these scriptures. Clement might have known them from oral information; or other lives of Jesus might exist from which he selected them; for Saint Luke in his Gospel, (i. 1,) actually declares, that in his time many such lives of Jesus were read among the Christians. From this cause Lardner[19] also is in doubt, whether he could call these passages testimonies for the historical truth of the books of our New Testament.

Whatever besides is usually quoted from the epistle of Clement for the authenticity of the New Testament, is of infinitely less value. Some of these sentences agree with our New Testament only in common-place maxims, or, indeed, only in a word or two. "Let us come up," says Clement,[20] "to the glorious and venerable rule of our holy calling." This, it is pretended, is a quotation from the passage, 2 Tim. i. 9, "Who hath called us with an holy calling." "Nothing," says he in another place,[21] "is impossible with God, but to lie;" which is pretended to be taken from Heb. vi. 18, where something similar is said of God. We might in this manner prove that Seneca, Plutarch, nay, even Socrates and Plato, had quoted the New Testament. Others, indeed, have a greater resemblance in thought and expression; but they are not therefore of necessity taken from our New Testament. Clement might have learnt them through personal intercourse with the apostles, or have borrowed them from the books of the Old Testament,[22] or from other Christian writings[23] which then existed.

Dr Mill, in the Prolegomena to his edition of the New Testament, No. 140, draws the following inference from this epistle of Clement:—That Clement had read our first three Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistle to the Romans, the two Epistles to the Corinthians, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of Saint James, and the First Epistle of Saint Peter. From such conclusions the most convenient opportunities are afforded to unbelievers, of bringing into discredit the whole body of evidence for the truth of Christianity. I dare not attempt to prove from this ancient document more than that our First Epistle to the Corinthians is authentic.

In reading this venerable work of a teacher, who was an intimate friend of the Apostle Paul, who was also well acquainted with the other apostles, and had undoubtedly a perfect knowledge of all their doctrines and writings; who even himself presided, at the time of the apostles, as bishop, over a community to which Saint Paul had written one of his longest epistles, many difficulties have very forcibly occurred to me. I will here point them out; perhaps they may excite others to examine this important document with more accuracy. —First, In this short epistle, which occupies about forty small octavo pages, Clement quotes almost fifty passages from the Old Testament, sometimes word for word, and sometimes by name. It was therefore by no means contrary to the fashion of those days to quote many scriptural passages by way of proof. Why, then, does he appeal to the Scriptures of the New Testament so seldom verbally, and only in a single instance by name? They were all at that time composed, the Revelation of Saint John perhaps excepted. For Clement wrote his epistle after the death of the Apostles Paul and Peter.[24] Secondly, In the xxiv—xxvi. and in the l. chap. p. 39—42, and p. 74, 75, he attempts to prove the resurrection of the dead, and quotes for that purpose many passages from the Old Testament, all of which in fact prove nothing. Whence is it, then, that he quotes not a single one among the great number of far clearer passages in the New Testament, particularly in the First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians? What could be more decisive to the Corinthians, to whom he wrote, than the determination of the apostle, who had wrought so many miracles among them, and of whose divine inspiration they had no doubt?

Having frequently made these difficulties the subject of my consideration, it appears to me that much may be said to lessen, if not entirely to remove, their force. As to the first, I answer, That Clement very rarely makes his quotations from the Old Testament by name; but almost constantly only according to their contents. Nor was it very customary for the ancient writers to quote by name, as may be seen for instance in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which the author quotes generally according to the contents only, or with an indeterminate phrase, "one in a certain place testified," (ch. i. ii.) Moreover, Clement presumed that the contents of the New Testament were already known to the Christians at Corinth. But this he could not presume in respect of the Old Testament, which was generally unknown to the heathen converts. With regard to the second difficulty, it appears to me that the immediate object of Clement was not so much to prove the truth of this doctrine of Christianity, as to shew its harmony with the doctrine of the Old Testament. For this reason he quotes, however ill applied, passages of the Old Testament exclusively, and in such profusion. The doctrine itself he presupposes to be true, and to be believed. The beginning of the 47th chapter, "Receive the epistle of the holy Paul; what has he there written to you?" rendered all farther quotations of particular passages of this epistle unnecessary.

---

[18] Chap. 46, p. 70.

[19] *Credibility*, vol. ii. p. 31—33.

[20] Chap. vii. p. 11.

[21] Chap. xxvii. p. 42.

[22] For instance, in the 30th chap. p. 45, he quotes a passage, yet without naming its author,—"For God," says he, "resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble." This sentence is found, indeed, in James, iv. 6; but it stands also in Proverbs, iii. 34.

[23] The author of what is called the second epistle, is speaking of the wicked, chap. iv. p. 93, and then adds—"Concerning these the Lord has said, Though ye should be joined unto me, even in my very bosom, and keep not my commandments, I would reject you, and say unto you, Depart from me, I know you not, whence you are, you workers of iniquity." This passage is evidently similar to that in Matt. vii. 23. Nevertheless, it is not taken thence, but from an apocryphal book. In the same manner Clement, when he quotes the discourses or actions of Christ, may have taken them from some other history that was extant when he wrote. For the other historians of the life of Jesus might have been equally credible men, as those whose memoirs are contained in the New Testament, although they did not write, like the latter, from divine inspiration.

[24] Chap. v. p. 9, 10.

3. *Hermas.*

We have an ancient writing under the title of Pastor,[1] or Shepherd, which bears the name of Hermas, whom Saint Paul (Rom. xvi. 14) enumerates among those to whom he particularly sends salutation. It contains, as we have it at present, three books. In the first, which has the title "Visiones," are four visions. The Church of God appears to him four times, in the form of an old woman, gives him various doctrines, (which are very commonplace, and not always just,) and particularly informs him, that the Christians had much tribulation to expect, but that they might overcome it by patience and prayer. After some time appears a venerable man, in the habit of a shepherd, and dictates to him as he writes, twelve commands, which contain a kind of catechetical instruction in morality, very incomplete, and in part bad and unchristian: These are the contents of the second book, which is therefore called "Mandata." Again, this venerable man dictates to him certain types, comparisons, and narratives, in which are veiled certain moral truths, and the future fortunes of the church. These compose the third book, which on this account is entitled "Similitudines." The work was written originally in Greek; but we have now only an ancient Latin version,[2] except a few fragments preserved in the Greek fathers, and which may be seen in Cotelerius.

If we were to form our judgment of the author from the book itself, we should suppose it to have been written by one who was a Jew by birth, and who lived in the first century. The rigid adherence to fasts, and high idea of their meritoriousness;[3] the figurative and allegorical kind of representation;[4] the quoting of the book Heldam et Modal;[5] and the Hebrew name[6] given to the angel, or, as others explain it, to the frightful beast which appeared to him; these evidently betray a writer, who was educated in the Jewish mode of thinking. And that it was composed in the first century, is probable from the first book. In this the old woman foretells the fortunes of the church, and indeed in a very mysterious manner. But all her prophecies are so general and indeterminate, that nothing more can be learnt from them than that "the Christians were to be greatly persecuted." Now had the author lived later, in the second, or even third century, for instance, he would certainly have made his prophetess to give a more determinate and complete description of those persecutions; of the tyrants who should command them; of the cruelties, and modes of torment and death which should hereafter be made use of; and subjects of the like nature. The author, it may be added, who in the whole composition appears to have been a good, though an ill-informed man, calls himself Hermas, and assures his reader, that he wrote it at Rome,[7] and at the time when Clement was bishop of that church.[8] We perceive, therefore, even without external evidence, that it is extremely probable that this work came from the apostolical Hermas. And this is corroborated by the express testimonies of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, and Jerome, who not only inform us, that the apostolical Hermas did really leave us such a book, but they also quote from it many and long passages, and these exactly agreeing with our present copies.[9] We cannot, therefore, refuse to attribute this book to the above-mentioned writer, without bringing into suspicion the whole of ecclesiastical history.

---

[1] It stands in Cotelerius, vol. i. pp. 75—126.

[2] Whoever desires to be farther informed respecting the opinions of learned men on these writings of the apostolical period, may consult the first volume of "Le Nourry Apparatus ad Bibliothecam Maximam Patrum et Antiquorum Scriptorum Eccles. Lugduni edit." in which every thing that belongs to the subject is treated with great accuracy and copiousness. The account of the Pastor is to be found, pp. 47—70.

[3] See Similitud. V.

[4] See the Visiones and the Similitudines.

[5] Visio. ii. § 3, p. 77.—"The Lord is nigh to them that turn unto him, as it is written in the book of Heldam and Modal, who prophesied to the people in the wilderness." These are the words of the author himself. The history to which he alludes, is found in Num. xi. 26, 27. But the Hebrew names of these prophets are Eldad and Medad. In the "Synops. Scripturæ S." which is known under the name of Athanasius, there is a book Heldam and Modal mentioned among the apocryphal writings of the Old Testament.

[6] The name in the work itself is Hegrin, העירין. See Visio. iv. § 2, p. 83, and Not. Oxoniens. in loc.

[7] Visio. i. § 1. p. 75.

[8] For, in Visio. ii. § 4, p. 78, he receives a command to write two copies of this prophecy, and to send one of them to Clement, who would transmit it to the foreign cities.

Eusebius gives us the following information concerning the *Pastor*, which many in his time supposed to have been written by the apostolical Hermas,—"That some believed it to be a very useful book, as an introduction to religion, and that it was therefore read publicly in the churches."[10] This opinion agrees very well with the work which we have at present. Its style is entirely adapted to the senses. The "Similitudines" in which the writer clothes his instruction, are nothing more than a collection of similies, taken from common objects, for instance, from a vine, a green tree, or a flock. This is the case also with the "Mandata" and "Visiones." And thus we in modern times compose books of instruction for children; but, indeed, with this difference, that it is written in a rough and unpolished style. The whole plan of the book is, if I may use the expression, dramatic; as if adapted to children and beginners. The author does not teach, but relates. The first book is the narrative of his conferences with a venerable matron; and the other two contain the relation of his conversation with a shepherd. These conversations are throughout dramatic. A splendid tower is erected by a variety of artists, and composed of stones of every species. Hermas walks into the country; here his instructor points out, now a vine, now a tree just shooting forth its leaves; and, at every prospect, takes occasion to instruct him. The writer of this book is sometimes represented as an enthusiast, who fancied that he saw a variety of visions, and heard revelations. We might with equal justice, on account of the fairy tales in her Magazine for Children, call Beaumont a fanatic.

This form in which Hermas has composed his book, did not certainly afford him any opportunity to quote passages from the Bible, as proofs in his system of instruction. Many similar thoughts and expressions have been produced, of which Lardner[11] has collected a great number. But although this work is nearly as large as all the other writings of the apostolical fathers taken together, yet we cannot discover in it any where a single scriptural book cited expressly, and by name.

4. *Ignatius.*

Ignatius was bishop of Antioch; at the command of the Emperor Trajan, because he could not be prevailed on to renounce Christianity, he was conducted to Rome in the year of Christ 106, in order to fight with wild beasts exhibited at the public games; he remained constant, and was torn to pieces by lions in the amphitheatre. His seven genuine epistles[1] stand in Cotelerius, vol. ii. p. 11—42, and in Frey's edit. immediately after the epistles of Clement, pp. 1—73. These are tolerably well purified[2] from modern interpolations. I say tolerably well, for even the smaller edition appears in certain places to be still suspicious. In all these epistles, only a single book of the New Testament is expressly named by him, which is Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. Among the advantages belonging to the Ephesians, which Ignatius notices in his epistle to this community,[3] he distinguishes this in particular, that they had received the knowledge of the mystery of the holy Paul. "You are," says he, "fellow-partners in the mystery of the holy Paul, who in his whole epistle, makes honourable mention of you, as true members of Jesus Christ."[4] Saint Paul names the important doctrine to the publication of which he was peculiarly called, that is, the doctrine of the equal participation of the grace of God through Jesus by the heathens and Jews, the mystery, the heretofore unknown doctrine, *μυϛηριον*.[5] On this account Ignatius calls the Ephesians "fellow-partners in the mystery of Paul," (*Παυλου συμμυϛας*) and reminds them of the praises which the apostle had frequently bestowed on them in his epistle; that he might thereby excite in them a noble ambition. We have therefore in this passage an express evidence for the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Ephesians. For the supposition of the author of the "Letter concerning the persons to whom Saint Paul wrote what is called the Epistle to the Ephesians,"[6] that instead of *μνημονευει* must be read *μνημονευω*, is a conjecture which not only contradicts (as Lardner has observed on the cited passage) all manuscripts, but destroys also the whole connection of the twelfth section.

In the Epistle to the Philadelphians,[7] he gives them as it were an account of the sources from which he had drawn his faith. "I flee to the Gospel, as to the body of Christ; and to the Apostles, as to the presbytery of the Church. Let us also respect the Prophets; for they likewise published to men, that they should ground their hope on the Gospel, and on Jesus, and expect his coming."[8] Every one will acknowledge that by "the Prophets," Ignatius means the writings of the prophets of the Old Testament. Without doubt, then, he understands by "the Gospel," the writings of the evangelists; and by "the Apostles," the writings of the apostles. Again, when he warns them[9] against a love of disputation, and exhorts them to act in all things according to the doctrine of Christ, he represents to them his own example. "Hearing some persons declare," said he, "I believe nothing but what I find in the ancients, (or, according to another reading, the archives,) namely, inthe Gospel, I answered, but it is there written. And thereby I brought them to acknowledge that they would believe."[10] From these passages thus much is clear, that in the time of Ignatius there existed certain writings of the evangelists and apostles, formed into a collection. Their nature and number, however, is uncertain, since he has given us no catalogue of them.

---

[9] These passages are collected together in Cotelerius, vol. i. pp. 68—72, where they may be seen all at one view.

[10] *'Υφ' ἑτερων αναγκαιοτατον, ὁις μαλιϛα δει ϛοιχειωσεως εισαγωγικης, κεκριται ὁθεν ηδη και εν εκκλησιαις, ισμεν αυτο δεδημοσιευμενον.*—*Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. cap. 3. p. 90.

[11] *Credibility*, vol. ii. pp. 52—65.

[1] Besides the original, which is written in the Greek language, there is extant also an ancient Latin version, which is found in Cotelerius, pp. 124—131.

[2] See Jacobi Usserii *Dissertationes de Ignatii Epistolis*, in Cotelerius, vol. ii. p. 199, seq. but particularly, Joannis Pearsonii *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, ibid. p. 251, seq. and Joan. Clerici. *Diss. de Ignatii Epistolis*, ibid. p. 501, seq. and Prof. Schroeckh's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. ii. p. 337, of the original.

[3] § xii. p. 49.

[4] *Παυλου συμμυϛαι του ἡγιασμενου,—ὁς εν παση επιϛολη μνημονυει ὑμων εν Χριϛῳ Ιησου.* That *μνεμονευειν* sometimes means "to make honourable mention of one," is well known; should a proof of this be required, I refer the reader to Lardner, *Credibility*, vol. ii. p. 70.

[5] Rom. xvi. 25, 26; Eph. iii. 3—9.

[6] See Benson's *History of the First Planting of the Christian Religion*.

[7] § v. pp. 48, 49.

In these epistles are also many sentiments and expressions, which appear to have been borrowed from the Scriptures of our New Testament. In the epistle to the community at Smyrna,[11] Ignatius says of Jesus, "That he was according to the flesh, truly of the family of David, and a Son of God, according to the will and power of God." Saint Paul speaks of him almost in the same manner, (Rom. i. 3, 4.)—To the Ephesians[12] he writes, "The cross of Christ is a stumbling-block unto unbelievers; but to us, salvation and eternal life. Where is now the wise, and the profound inquirer? Where is the boasting of them that are called learned?" Saint Paul makes the same remark on the evangelical doctrine, (1 Cor. i. 18—31.)—Ignatius exhorts the Magnesians in almost the very words of Saint Paul, (1 Cor. v. 7, 8,) "Cast away the evil leaven, which is become old and sour; and be transformed into a new mass, which is Christ."[13] In the Epistle to Polycarp,[14] he recommends that he should exhort the men "to love their wives, even as Christ loves his Church." This excellent command is found in Eph. v. 25.—The many other passages in which the New Testament is said to have been quoted,[15] have either only a very distant similitude,[16] or are evidently different.[17]

Ignatius may therefore be produced as a clear evidence for the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Ephesians, and that in his time existed a collection of evangelical and apostolical writings. We may also with probability conclude from his epistle, that the Epistle to the Romans, and the First Epistle to the Corinthians, were at that period already written.

5. *Polycarp.*

Polycarp was an immediate disciple of Saint John the apostle, by whom he was also appointed to the bishoprick of Smyrna.[1] According to the information of Irenæus,[2] he left behind him various writings. But none of them are come down to us except his Epistle to the Philippians; and even this is no longer entire in the Greek original.[3]

In this work he testifies expressly, that Saint Paul had written an Epistle to the Philippians, in which he strengthened their faith, hope, and love towards God, Christ, and their neighbour. "Paul," says he,[4] "not only preached in person to you the true doctrine, but also when absent wrote epistles to you, by the study of which you will be able to edify yourselves in the faith which has been delivered to you." And in another place,[5] he expresses his astonishment at the covetousness of Valens, one of their presbyters. "But," he adds, "I have never observed, nor ever heard the same of you, among whom Paul preached. On the contrary, he makes mention of you in the beginning of his Epistle, and boasts of you in all communities."[6] He cites also expressly, although not by name, a passage from Saint Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, (vi. 2.) "An nescimus quia sancti mundum judicabunt? sicut Paulus docet."[7]— In like manner he appeals to the command which stands in the Holy Scriptures, "Be ye angry in such a manner that ye do not sin; and let not the sun go down upon your wrath."[8] Confido, vos bene exercitatos esse in Sacris Litteris. — Ut his scripturis dictum est, Irascimini et nolite peccare; et sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram. Now, since the passage, as here quoted, does not exist in any part of the Old Testament, but is found exclusively in the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Ephesians, (iv. 26,) this sentence may therefore be considered as an evidence that the Epistle to the Ephesians was already esteemed at that time as a divine Scripture.

---

[8] *Προσφυγων τῳ ευαγγελιῳ, ὡς σαρκι Ιησου, και τοις αποϛολοις, ὡς ϖρεσβυτεριῳ της εκκλησιας. Και τους ϖροφητας δε αγαπωμεν, δια το και αυτους εις το ευαγγελιον κατηγγελκεναι και εις αυτον ελπιζειν, και αυτον αναμενειν.*—Commentators have given a variety of opinions to account for Ignatius calling the Gospel *σαρξ Ιησου.* This appears to me to be the most natural cause, because it promulgates the accomplishment of the promises of the Old Testament. These are generally called the *shadow*, and Christ the substance, or *body.* Or this may be the reason, as Le Clerc has remarked on the passage, that he put as much confidence in the contents of the Gospel, as if Jesus were still alive, and assured him of its truth. The last words are obscure, in the way they are usually rendered. The translation given above appears to me to convey the true sense of the author.

[9] § viii. pp. 51, 52.

[10] I will subjoin this difficult passage, on which the commentators are so much at variance, in order that the reader may, without farther trouble, examine the translation which I have given above. *Επει ηκουσα τινων λεγοντων ὁτι εαν μη εν τοις αρχαιοις,* (or, according to a different reading, *αρχειοις,*) *ἑυρω, εν τῳ ευαγγελιῳ, ȣ ϖιϛευω. Και λεγοντος μου αυτοις, ὁτι γεγραπται, απεκριθησαν μοι, ὁτι ϖροκειται.* Ignatius, in the preceding sixth section, had exhorted the Philadelphians to beware of those who produced every kind of Jewish tenet, but were absolutely silent concerning Jesus Christ. I translate, therefore, the last words, "*ὁτι ϖροκειται*—Itaque propositum est," namely, credere; and understand the passage in this manner, that in their disputations they should trust exclusively to the decisions of the Gospel, and endeavour to convince their opponents therefrom with all gentleness. A similar passage is found in Epictetus, in *Arriani Dissertation. Epict.* Lib. iv. cap. 5, edit. Joan. Uptoni, tom. i. p. 599. He had taught in the preceding part, "that we should constantly live agreeably to nature," and adds, *Τουτο γαρ εϛιν, ὁ αει ϖροκειται τῳ καλῳ και αγαθῳ.*

[11] § i. p. 2.

[12] § xviii. p. 32.

[13] § x. p. 42.

[14] § v. p. 16.

[15] See Lardner's *Credibility of the G. H.* vol. ii. p. 70—85.

[16] As, for example, in Lardner, Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 13, 17, 18, 27, 31, 36, 38, 42.

[17] See Lardner, No. 43.

[1] See Irenæus, Lib. iii. cap. 3, § 4. Eusebius, Lib. iii. cap. 36, p. 130, and Hieronymus *De vir. Illustr.* cap. 13.

[2] In Eusebius, Lib. v. cap. 20.

[3] It stands in Cotelerius, vol. ii. pp. 186—189, and the old Latin version, which contains the entire epistle, pp. 190, 191. Both may be seen in the edit. of Frey, pp. 143—161. The testimonies of the above mentioned authors, and the passages cited by them, place the authenticity of this epistle beyond all doubt. If the fragments which are called *Responsiones* (in Coteler. l. cit. pp. 205, 206, and in Frey, p. 162—164) were the genuine production of Polycarp, they might be considered as an evident testimony for the authenticity of the four Gospels.

This epistle of Polycarp is throughout moral, and contains a variety of ethical maxims, delivered almost in the same words which we find in the Scriptures of our New Testament. —"Remember," says he,[9] "what the Lord taught, Judge not, that ye be not judged; forgive, and ye shall be forgiven; be merciful, that ye may obtain mercy; with the same measure that ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." Farther, "Blessed are the poor, and they that are persecuted for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of God." Passages of similar import are found in Saint Matthew, v. 3, 7, 10; vii. 1, 2; Saint Luke, vi. 20, 37, 38 — "We must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, in order that every one may give an account of himself."[10] This also is found in the same words, Rom. xiv. 10. 12. — He warns them[11] against covetousness with the very same arguments and expressions as are found in 1 Tim. vi. 7, 10; "The love of money is the root of all evil. Let us therefore well consider, that as we brought nothing into the world, so can we carry with us nothing out." In this work of Polycarp we meet besides with many sentiments in exactly the same dress in which they exist in the First Epistle of Saint Peter; which has also been remarked by Eusebius.[12] That I may not be too prolix, I will mention only the passages below.[13] From these passages alone, we cannot indeed conclude, that he has taken them from the under mentioned books of the New Testament;[14] but when joined with the numerous and clear evidences which will be produced in the following pages, they greatly corroborate the proof of the authenticity of the New Testament.

SECT. III. — TESTIMONIES FROM WORKS OF THE FIRST CENTURY, WHICH ARE NOW LOST.

To these evidences of the apostolical fathers, we are enabled to add yet some others from the first century. The writings themselves are, indeed, to the great loss of Christianity, no longer extant; but the following evidences from them have been preserved in part by Eusebius.

Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, was, according to Eusebius,[1] a man of very moderate understanding, but who employed so much the greater care in examining into the doctrines and history of Jesus and of his apostles, from their immediate acquaintance and disciples. He had collected considerable information, particularly from Aristion, and John the presbyter, (whom some conceived to be the author of the Apoclaypse) which information he delivered to posterity, under the title, *λογιων κυριακων ἐξηγησις*, "An Explication of the words of the Lord." But of this work nothing now remains, except the extracts which are preserved in Eusebius.

The information, properly belonging to the New Testament, which was contained in that book, is given us by Eusebius,[2] in the following words:—"'Mark, the interpreter of Peter, faithfully wrote what the latter had taught. He has not, indeed, placed the discourses and actions of Christ in their proper chronological order; for he was neither a hearer of the Lord himself, nor one of his immediate followers; but, as I have already mentioned, became afterwards acquainted with Peter, who taught according to the wants of his hearers, but without any view of giving a history of our Lord's discourses. Mark, however, committed no mistake in writing some things as they occurred to his memory. For he was anxious to omit nothing which he had heard, and to add nothing false to his account.' — This is Papias' information concerning Saint Mark. And of Saint Matthew he writes, 'Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew language, and every one interpreted it as well as he could.' — The same Papias makes use also of certain evidences from the First Epistle of Saint John, and the First Epistle of Saint Peter. He relates likewise another story of a woman accused before the Lord of many crimes; which history is found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews."[3] This passage deposes an irrefragable evidence for the Gospels of Saint Matthew and Saint Mark, the First Epistle of Saint Peter, and the First Epistle of Saint John. But if Saint Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, (or, as we call it, Chaldee,) which hence appears to be manifest, yet it is equally certain from other grounds, that he composed it likewise in Greek. The Christians in Palestine used the Hebrew original; added to it many things taken from other gospels, genuine and spurious; and this is that anciently celebrated Gospel of the Hebrews, or as it is likewise named, of the Nazarenes.[4]

---

[4] § iii. pp. 146, 147 [5] § ix. p. 150.

[6] See Philip. i. 3—5. In the former of these two passages the plural number stands in the Greek, *ὃς — εγραψεν επιστολας*. But it is by no means uncommon to use this word in the plural number, although only a single epistle is meant. Comp. Cotelerii not. in loc. Lardner supposes that Polycarp in this place intended not only the Epistle to the Philippians, but also both the Epistles of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians. *Credibility*, vol. ii. pp. 91, 92.

[7] § xi. p. 150. [8] § xii. p. 150. [9] § ii. pp. 145, 146.

[10] § vi. p. 150. [11] § iv. p. 147.

[12] Hist. Eccl. lib. xv. cap. 14, p. 162. *Πολυκαρπος εν τη δηλωθειση προς φιλιππησιους αυτου γραφη, φερομενη εις δευρο, κεχρηται τισι μαρτυριαις απο της Πετρου προτερας επιστολης.*

[13] Compare § i. p. 144, with 1 Pet. i. 8; § ii. p. 145, with 1 Pet. i. 21; § ii. latter part, with 1 Pet. iii. 9; and § v. p. 149, with 1 Pet. ii. 11.

[14] See above, p. 13.

[1] Hist. Eccles. iii. cap. 39, pp. 135, 138. In this place, Eusebius treats amply of the history and writings of Papias. The decision which he makes in p. 137, *σφοδρα —— σμικρος ων τον νουν, ὡς αν εκ των αυτου λογων τεκμηραμενον ειπειν φαινεται*, must not be considered as a contradiction of the passage in Lib. iii. cap. 36, p. 130; for the opinion which is found there — *Παπιας —— ανηρ τα παντα ὁτι μαλιστα λογιωτατος και της γραφης ειδημων*—is the interpolation of a Scholiast. See Valesius in loc.

[2] Pages 137, 138.

In case Papias had advanced in his book still farther evidences of a similar nature, and we have reason to suppose that he did so, Eusebius would have rendered great service to posterity if he had extracted them. But it is much to be lamented that he often excerpts the old writers not so completely as scholars must desire. In the thirty-sixth chapter of the third book of his Eccl. Hist. (p. 133,) in which he continues his account of the Christian teachers in the reign of Trajan, he says, that many of them left their native country, and exercised the office of evangelist, zealously announcing Christ to those who had yet heard nothing of the preaching of faith, and delivering to them the Scripture of the divine Gospels.[5] Eusebius, a man of an integrity universally acknowledged, assures us, that he drew his information from the documents of antiquity which he found in the library at Cæsarea. We are therefore certain, that as early as the beginning of the second century, the four Gospels, which were received in Eusebius's time, that is, the Gospels of Saint Matthew, Saint Mark, Saint Luke, and Saint John, were universally known among the Christians; and not only esteemed as genuine writings of the men above mentioned, but also as of divine inspiration.

CHAPTER II.

WITNESSES IN THE SECOND CENTURY.

In the second century, the evidences for the Scriptures of the New Testament are far more numerous, determinate, and ample, because we still possess more and larger works of the teachers of this period. I shall not therefore stop to quote the passages themselves, but only name the witnesses, and point out those parts of their writings, where their evidence is to be found. But I will first describe the state of Christianity in the second and third centuries.

SECT. I. — STATE OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES.

In the East, (namely, Palestine, Chaldea, and Persia,) where Christianity received its origin, at that time prevailed a mixture of opinions, for the most part false, but which bore the venerable name of philosophy, and had been for a long time embraced by many even at Alexandria, which city, since the Ptolomies, was become the chief seat of learning. This Oriental philosophy (we will admit the honourable appellation for the sake of brevity) was distinguished from the Grecian, principally in three points, namely, in the doctrine of spirits; the maintaining of two original beings; and in morality. In the doctrine of spirits these philosophers had not only regular genealogies of spirits, which they called Æons; but had also invented a particular science, Theurgy, or a collection of rules, to call up spirits and compel them to satisfy the desires of men. Again, in order to solve that great problem of the understanding—the origin of evil—they adopted two equally eternal and powerful original beings, one good, the other bad. From the bad was derived all matter, consequently the bodies of men, which were therefore the seat of every sin. And from this principle flowed the whole of that gloomy, morose, melancholy system of morals adopted by the philosophers of the East, which placed true virtue in the rejection of all the pleasures of sense, and in the severe treatment, mortification, and torture of the body.[1] These opinions were likewise not uncommon among the Jews, as may be collected from the refutations of them in the New Testament, and from the writings of Josephus. The Pharisees laid a great stress on Theurgy; and through the exercise of this visionary art, they obtained a great part of their consequence among the people. The Essenes, in particular, adopted the whole system.

---

[3] Μαρκος μεν ἑρμηνευτης Πετρου γενομενος, ὁσα, εμνημονευσεν, ακριβως εγραψεν, ου μεντοι ταξει τα υπο του Χριστου η λεχθεντα, η πραχθεντα· ουτε γαρ ηκουσε του κυριου, ουτε παρηκολουθησεν αυτω· ὑστερον δε ὡς εφην, Πετρω, ὁς προς τας χρειας εποιειτο τας διδασκαλιας, αλλ' ουχ ὡσπερ συνταξιν των Κυριακων ποιουμενος λογων· ὡστε ουδεν ἡμαρτε Μαρκος, ὁυτως ενια γραψας ὡς απεμνημονευσεν· ἑνος γαρ εποιησατο προνοιαν, του μηδεν ὡν ηκουσε παραλιπειν η ψευσασθαι τι εν αυτοις· ταυτα μεν ουν ἱστορηται τῳ Παπιᾳ περι του Μαρκου· περι δε του Ματθαιου ταυτ' ειρηται· Ματθαιος μεν ουν Εβραιδι διαλεκτῳ τα λογια συνεγραψατο· ἡρμηνευσε δ' αυτα ὡς εδυνατο ἑκαστος· κεχρηται δ' αυτος μαρτυριαις απο της Ιωαννου προτερας επιστολης, και της Πετρου ὁμοιως· εκτεθειται δε και αλλην ἱστοριαν περι γυναικος, επι πολλαις ἁμαρτιαις διαβληθεισης επι του κυριου, ἡν το καθ' Ἑβραιους Ευαγγελιον περιεχει.

[4] See Fabricii *Cod. Apocr. N. T.* I. 355.

[5] Και γαρ δη πλειστοι των τοτε μαθητων, σφοδροτερῳ φιλοσοφιας ερωτι προς του θειου λογου την ψυχην πληττομενοι, την Σωτηριον προτερον απεπληρουν παρακελευσιν, ενδεεσι νεμοντες τας ουσιας. επειτα δε αποδημιας στελλομενοι, εργον επετελουν ευαγγελιστων, τοις ετι παμπαν ανηκοοις του της πιστεως λογου κηρυττειν τον Χριστον φιλοτιμουμενοι, και την των θειων ευαγγελιων παραδιδοναι γραφην.

This Oriental philosophy insinuated itself by degrees also among the followers of the Grecian systems. Of these, none had been so generally received as that of Plato, which was in most parts excellent. But it became gradually much changed and corrupted, not only through ignorance, misunderstanding, and innovation; but also by being intermixed, particularly by Plotinus of Alexandria,[2] a Platonist of the third century, with the Oriental systems. Thus arose the New-Platonic philosophy; a mixture of the Platonic, but very much corrupted, and of the Oriental philosophy: and this became the principal source from which were derived the perversions, mutilations, and most abominable corruptions of genuine Christianity.

For until the second century, the Christians always persisted in the sound exposition of the New Testament. To this period they continued free, if we except the joyless morality of the Essenes, from the distractions of Pseudo-philosophy; and maintained among themselves genuine apostolical Christianity. But scarcely had some of the scholars of the heathen world (for instance Clement of Alexandria) acknowledged Christianity, when the Pseudo-philosophy of the Easterns and New-Platonists, broke in like a rapid torrent, and left behind universal desolation. Until this time the doctrines of the Christian religion had been preached without exception, and with the greatest publicity, to all who would hear them, and, as the founder of Christianity expressed himself in his charge to the apostles, (Matth. x.) "from the house tops." But now, in resemblance of the heathen mysteries, certain ceremonies and doctrines began to be concealed, and thus Christianity assumed its mysteries as well as heathenism. Besides, a variety of heathen ceremonies were adopted in the divine service, and hence Christianity became gradually a ceremonial religion. Since Origen, in the third century, this system of religion, which commands, in a particular manner, the strictest adherence to truth, was perverted so much, that it was declared a duty of charity to forge miracles, and in short, every thing else, if by these means converts might be made to their religion; nay, this was carried to such a pitch of shameless effrontery, that these infamous forgeries were named, pious deceits, *piæ fraudes.* The zealous supporters of the New-Platonic philosophy intermixed their system, even that part of it which is called Platonic love, with Christianity. Socrates and Plato defended the most intimate union of men with beautiful boys, in such a manner, that they made a distinction between corporeal and spiritual love; and asserted, that the wise man feels only the latter in respect to the beauty of the boy, in order to conduct him to virtue. Hence arose, in the third century, that most infamous custom for persons of the opposite sexes, without being united in the bonds of marriage, to live with one another in the closest intimacy; in order, as they pretended, to establish a mere union of souls for the purposes of virtue. But the most injurious effects, and the almost mortal blow which Christianity received from that Pseudo-philosophy of the Easterns, and more especially of the New-Platonists, was the utter neglect, mutilation, and subversion of morals, together with the mystical mode of interpreting the New Testament. The simple and perspicuous system of morality which Christianity taught, was too light for these pretended philosophers; it afforded too little matter for their fancies and speculations. It became, therefore, neglected, and since the third century the whole importance was made to consist in the theory of Christianity, or rather of the Oriental Platonic Christianity. But the matter did not rest even here; the religion became burdened with the above mentioned theurgy, and corporeal mortification; and through the assistance of mystical and ridiculous interpretations, every error and every impurity which the passions or caprice of men desired, were introduced into the New Testament. In this manner, that easy, beautiful, immediately and universally active, cheerful, and philanthropic religious system of the New Testament, became during the second, and more particularly the third century, a gloomy, harsh, misanthropic system of whims, fancies, monkery, deceit, and hierarchical tyranny.

---

[1] See, 1. The information contained in Xenophon, Plato, Aristotle, and Diogenes Laertius Procem. Vitar. Philos. § viii.; 2. The fragments of Zoroaster in Eusebii Præparat. Evangel.; 3. The doctrines of the Brahmins; 4. The refutations in Saint Paul; and, 5. The doctrines of the Gnostics and Manicheans. Compare Moshemii Instit. H. E. majores, sec. i. 136, 339, with Dissert. de causis suppositorum librorum inter Christian. sec. i. et ii. vol. i. dissert. in H. E. p. 223 seq. But the learned and ingenious man, who every where perceived systems, which his philosophical head had created, appears absolutely to err, when he supposes, that in the East existed a peculiar sect, which had brought all those tenets into a regular system. It is more probable that there existed a variety of sects, which occasionally adopted different doctrines.

[2] Plotinus, a disciple of Ammonias Saccas, travelled into Persia, purposely to learn the doctrines of the Indians and Persians. He was the master of the celebrated philosopher and enemy of Christianity, Porphyry, who also edited his works. Mosheim too much indulges his wit here also, as has been remarked and proved by Semler, Walch, and others. Prof. Meiners has treated this subject very amply in his "Considerations on the New-Platonic Philosophy," Leipsig, 1782, 8vo.

To these dreadful calamities from within were added also from without incessant persecutions, which were often general, and sometimes extremely bloody and cruel. Even the worthy Trajan, and yet the more excellent Marcus Antoninus, tortured and put to death many of their most faithful subjects only because they were not idolaters, but chose to live according to the laws of Christianity, which even the heathens themselves acknowledged to be irreproachable and excellent.[3] But the most horrible of all these persecutions began to rage against the Christians about the year 249. The Emperor Decius proceeded so far as to attempt to exterminate Christianity by the roots. By his orders the Christians were not only put to death, but were also afflicted with the most exquisite tortures. A Christian, for instance, had his whole body smeared with honey, and then, his hands tied behind his back, exposed quite naked to the meridian sun, where myriads of insects assailed him, and consumed his body by insensible degrees.[4]

Nevertheless this religion was continually extending itself in all the parts of the then known world. In Gaul there already existed flourishing communities at Lyons and Vienne, in Germany, in Britain, in Africa, and every where the number of Christians so increased, that even in the beginning of the second century the heathens complained that the temples of the gods were quite deserted; and towards the end of the third, the court and army of the heathen emperors were filled with persons of this persuasion. This extensive propagation of Christianity was undoubtedly the consequence of the continually increasing promulgation of the Scriptures of the New Testament. As early as the beginning of the second century were made Latin and Syriac versions. Learned men (particularly Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and his scholar Pierius) were anxious to have accurate transcripts of the original; and opulent men, (especially Pamphilus,) caused, at a great expense, many exact copies of it to be taken and dispersed.[5] We will now hear the individual witnesses themselves.

1. *Justin Martyr.*

Justin, surnamed the Martyr, before his conversion to the Christian faith, had carefully studied the Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean, and Platonic systems of philosophy; and must therefore be considered, on account of his learning and antiquity, as a witness of the greatest importance.[1] It is necessary to read only his "Address to the Gentiles," (λογος ϖρος ῾Ελληνας, pp. 1—3), "The Exhortation to the Gentiles," λογος ϖαραινετικος ϖρος ῾Ελληνας, pp. 6—36,) and the work, "On the only God," (ϖερι μοναρχιας, pp. 36—42,) in order to be convinced of his extensive reading in the best writings of antiquity. These works of Justin prove incontestably that the first followers of Christianity were not by any means such as its enemies assert, universally unlearned and simple men. Justin was much better acquainted with the works and opinions of Plato, Aristotle, and Pythagoras, and with the writings of Orpheus, Homer, Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, than most of those who are pleased to assert that the heathen authors are the only sources of all wisdom, but the followers of Jesus universally mean and simple men.

Besides the Revelation of Saint John,[2] Justin has not quoted in any part of his works from a single writer of the New Testament by name. But he appeals often and expressly to the Gospels, which were composed by the apostles and their assistants, as to those books from which the Christians derived their tenets. In his first Apology (presented to the Emperor Antoninus the Pious) he gives this reason for the celebration of the Lord's Supper among the Christians:[3] "For the apostles, in the memoirs which are named Gospels, have thus assured us, that Jesus ordered them to do it; that he took bread, gave thanks, and then said, This do in remembrance of me: this is my body. That in like manner he took the cup, and after he had given thanks, said, This is my blood." And in his advice concerning the behaviour of the Christians at their Sunday meetings, he mentions even, "that the memoirs of the apostles, or the writings of the prophets, are publicly read; and when the reader has ended, the president of the community exhorts them to the imitation of such excellent things."[4] An evident proof, that as early as the beginning of the second century the Gospels were not only generally known among the Christians, but were revered, even as the Scriptures of the Old Testament, that is, as divine books.

---

[3] Let the reader consult, for instance, Plinii Epist. 97, lib. x.

[4] See Schroeckh's *Ecclesiastical Hist.* iv. 190, of the original.

[5] See Prof. Schroeckh's *Ecclesiastical Hist.* Part i—iv. and C. R. Walch, *On the use of the Holy Scripture among the ancient Christians*—Leipsig, 1779, 8vo.

[1] Concerning the circumstances of his life, principles, and writings, the most accurate and ample information is to be found in the Preface to the Benedictine Edit. of his works, Haag, 1742, fol. Besides the genuine and spurious works of Justin, this edition contains also, Tatian's Oration against the Gentiles, pp. 241—276; Athenagoras's Apology for the Christians, pp. 277—313; and his Treatise on the Resurrection of the Dead, pp. 314—336; the three books of Theophilus of Antioch to Autolycus, pp. 337—400; the Satire of Hermas on the Heathen Philosophers, pp. 401—406; and the fragments of the lost writings of Justin, Tatian, and Athenagoras; together with the Acts of the Martyrdom of Justin, p. 585, and fol. His first Apology is a well written defence of the Christians against the calumniations of the Gentiles.

[2] Dialogus cum Tryphone, cap. lxxxi. p. 179. Και ϖαρ᾽ ἡμιν ανηρ τις, ᾧ ονομα Ιωαννης, ἑις των αποϛολων του Χριϛου, εν Αποκαλυψει γενομενῃ αυτῳ, Χιλια ετη ϖοιησειν εν Ιερουσαλημ τους τῳ ἡμετηρῳ Χριϛῳ ϖιϛευσαντας ϖρουφητευσε, και μετα ταυτα την καθολικην και —— αιωνιαν ὁμοθυμαδον ἁμα ϖαντων αναϛασιν γενησεσθαι και κρισιν· "A man from among us, whose name was John, and an Apostle of Christ, has prophesied in his Revelation, that they who believe in our Christ, shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem; and after that, shall follow the universal and eternal resurrection and judgment."

The view with which Justin composed his works did not allow him to use the Scriptures of the New Testament by way of proof. We find, nevertheless, where opportunities occur, a variety of passages, and these quoted with the addition that they were to be found in the Christian Scriptures. Thus, in the *First Apology*, in which he speaks of the excellent laws of Jesus, and the virtuous actions of the Christians,[5] of their hope of a future resurrection,[6] and of their customary mode of Baptism and of Supper of the Lord,[7]—and likewise in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, when he treats of the prophecies which Jesus had pronounced,[8] of John the Baptist,[9] of the morality which Jesus taught,[10] of Mary the mother of Jesus,[11] and of the insults offered to the dying Saviour,[12] many passages are quoted from Saint Matthew, Saint Mark, Saint Luke, and Saint John, word for word. And the whole *Dialogue with Trypho* is, in particular, a repetition of the history of the life of Jesus, as it appears at present in our Gospels. In this work Justin compares the circumstances in the life of Jesus with the characters attributed to the Messiah in the Old Testament, and concludes, from their having been exactly fulfilled in him, that he was the Messiah promised by God.

2. *Tatian.*

Tatian, the father of the Encratites, shews himself, in his *Oration against the Gentiles*,[1] to have been a man who, from his travels, had become intimately acquainted with the world; and from reading, familiar with the best writers, and with the history of the Gentiles. In this *Oration* he informs the Gentiles how little reason they had to boast of their philosophers, and of their wisdom; and presses them with very pointed reproofs drawn from their own writings, laws, actions, and manners. In a work of this kind we can easily suppose, that the author had no opportunity of quoting the Scriptures of the New Testament; and we therefore find, in two passages excepted,[2] that they are never once mentioned. But this witness had deposed so much the more in favour of their authenticity in his other writings, which are now lost, except a few fragments preserved by different authors. I shall produce him again, at the conclusion of this century, among the remaining witnesses, whose testimonies are known to us only through the information of others.

3. *Irenæus.*

Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, had not only lived very near the times of the apostles, but had enjoyed familiar intercourse with one of their immediate disciples and friends.[1] In his five books against Heresies, he delivers very ample and clear testimonies for the historical truth of the Scriptures of the New Testament. He quotes all the evangelists often and by name; relates the cause and design of their writings; and declares that there were only four Gospels, namely, those of Saint Matthew, Saint Mark, Saint Luke, and Saint John, which were accounted genuine and divine books.[2] In opposition to the Valentinians, he proves by many passages from the Gospels of Saint Matthew,[3] Saint Mark,[4] Saint Luke,[5] and Saint John,[6] and also from the Acts of the Apostles by Saint Luke,[7] that there is but one God, the Creator and Preserver of all things. To the writings of Saint Paul, he appeals yet more frequently. He proves his tenets against the heretics most commonly from Saint Paul's Epistle to the Romans, the two Epistles to the Corinthians, the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, those to Timothy, and the Epistle to Titus. He asserts, in many places, that these twelve epistles were the genuine and divine works of Saint Paul;[8] makes numerous and sometimes long extracts from them, evidently proving to every reader, that they are the very same which we at this time possess in the New Testament.[9] In like manner he testifies also the authenticity of the First Epistle of Saint Peter;[10] the First and Second Epistles of Saint John;[11] and the Revelation of the same apostle.[12]

---

[3] Apolog. I. cap. lxvi. p. 83.—See also Dialog. cum Tryphone Judæo, cap. ciii. p. 199. Εν τοις απομνημονευμασι των αποστολων γεγραπται, προσελθων (namely, σατανας) αυτῳ (Christ) και πειραζων μεχρι του ειπειν αυτῳ, προσκυνησον μοι, και αποκρινασθαι αυτῳ τον Χριστον, ὑπαγε οπισω μου σατανα· Κυριον τον Θεον σου προσκυνησεις και αυτῳ μονῳ λατρευσεις. And in the same place: Εν τοις απομνημονευμασι ἁ φημι ὑπο των αποστολων αυτου και των εκεινοις παρακολουθησαντων συντεταχθαι, ὅτι ἱδρως ὡσει θρομβοι κατεχειτο, αυτου ευχομενου και λεγοντος, παρελθετω, ει δυνατον, το ποτηριον τουτο.

[4] Apologia I. cap. lxvii. p. 83. Και τῃ του ἡλιου λεγομενῃ ἡμερα, παντων κατα πολεις η αγρους μενοντων επι το αυτο συνελευσις γινεται, και τα απομνημονευματα των αποστολων, η τα συγγραμματα των προφητων αναγινωσκεται μεχρις εγχωρει· ειτα παυσαμενου του αναγινωσκοντος, ὁ προεστως δια λογου την νουθεσιαν και προκλησιν της των καλων τουτων, μιμησεως ποιειται.

[5] Apolog. I. cap. xv.—xvii. pp. 52—54.

[6] Apolog. I. cap. xix. p. 55.

[7] Apolog I. cap. lxi.—lxvii. pp. 79—84.

[8] Dialog. cum Tryph. cap. xxxv. p. 132; cap. lxxvi. p. 137; cap. cvii. p. 201.

[9] Dialog. cum Tryph. cap. xlix. p. 145; cap. li. p. 147; cap. lxxxviii. p. 186.

[10] Dialog. cum Tryph. cap. xciii. p. 190.

[11] Dialog. cum Tryph. cap. c. p. 196.

[12] Dialog. cum Tryph. cap. ci. p. 196.

[1] See above, p. 23, note [1].—The Preface there noticed gives ample information concerning his life, writings, and opinions.

[2] Cap. xiii. p. 255, and cap. xix. p. 261. In the first passage he asserts, that the soul is καθ' ἑαυτην σκοτος, και ουδεν εν αυτῃ φοτεινον; (how this is to be understood is explained by the editor in his Preface, Part. II. cap. xi. § iii. pp. 49—51;) and then adds, και τουτο εστιν αρα το ειρημενον· ἡ σκοτια το φως ου καταλαμβανει, (John, i. 5.) In the other passage he quotes John, i. 3, with these words, παντα ὑπ' αυτου, και χωρις αυτου γεγονεν ουδε ἑν.

[1] In the above mentioned edition of his works by Massuet, very copious information is given concerning his life, opinions, and writings, in the prefixed *Dissertationes præv. ad Irenæum.* He left many works, which are named by Eusebius and Jerome; But of these, if we except a few fragments, nothing is now remaining besides his *Libri Quinque Adversus Hæreses.* Even these have not come down to us in the Greek original, but are extant only in an ancient Latin version. The authenticity of this work has been amply proved by C. R. Walch; see Rösler's *Ecclesiastical Fathers*, v. 264—270.

He asserts that these writings were divine, and the sure foundation of the Christian faith.[13] What his opinion of the other books of the New Testament was, we cannot, from his silence, determine. He appears to have considered the Epistle to the Hebrews as neither the work of Saint Paul, nor a divine book.[14] This is a proof, that the first Christians were not so credulous as modern infidels represent them. Had they received all at random, without examination, then certainly they would not have rejected so universally the apocryphal writings, and hesitated to acknowledge the authenticity of some of the books of the New Testament.

In his time collections[15] of the evangelical and apostolical writings were already in the hands of many Christians. They were diligently studied; and in order that those who were not opulent might not be deceived by any corrupted copies, he advised them to apply to the teachers of the church. "All the divine Scriptures," says he, [16] "both Prophecies and Gospels, are open and clear, and may be consulted by all." And in another place,[17] "That man will easily convince himself of this, (namely, that the Old and New Testament came from one and the same God,) who diligently studies the divine Scriptures which are in the possession of the presbyters of the church."

Besides the evangelical and apostolical works above mentioned, Irenæus acknowledges no other to be divine. He appeals indeed often, and with high panegyric, to the writings of Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Papias, Hermas, and Justin Martyr, but he never betrays any such veneration for them, as he shews for the writings of the evangelists and apostles.[18]

Here then we have an extraordinarily important evidence for the historical truth of the greatest part of the books of the New Testament: it is the evidence of a man who lived so near the times of the apostles, who had enjoyed an intimate intercourse with one of their immediate disciples, and was therefore as capable of investigating accurately the truth of those writings, as we are of proving the historical truth of a work attributed to Grotius or Selden: it is the evidence of a man who was well read in all the works respecting Christianity, both of the orthodox and heretics; who himself doubted of the truth of some books of the New Testament, and consequently must be considered in this point as totally exempt from credulity. This witness, thus qualified, appeals in the face of heretics to those writings, as to works which descended incontestably from the apostles and evangelists. We should, undoubtedly, without hesitation, pronounce every other book, resting only on a single evidence of such weight, to be genuine. Why then should not the testimony of this witness have its full force on the Scriptures of the New Testament?

---

[2] The most particular passages are, Lib. iii. cap. 1, p. 174, and cap. 2, p. 190—192. That he makes use of such strange arguments, from the four winds, &c. by way of proof, is of no consequence to us in the present inquiry. It is sufficient, that he expressly asserts, that in his time no other Gospels, but the four above mentioned, were received among Christians.

[3] L. cit. cap. 9, pp. 184, 185.

[4] L. cit. cap. 10, pp. 185—188. [5] Ibid.

[6] L. cit. cap. 11, pp. 188—190.

[7] L. cit. cap. 12, pp. 193—198.

[8] For in his quotations he makes use of the following phrases:—"Paul has this in his Epistle to the Romans," lib. 3, cap. 16, p. 205. "Paul shews this in his First—or—Second Epistle to the Corinthians," lib. 3, cap. 7, p. 182; lib. 4, cap. 27, p. 264. He uses these, or similar forms of quotation, for every one of the above mentioned epistles.

[9] Lardner has collected proofs thereof in his *Credibility of the G. H.* vol. ii. pp. 157—169.

[10] He quotes this epistle also, with the same introductory phrase—"Peter says in his epistle."—Lib. iv. cap. 9, p. 238.

[11] See Lib. iii. cap. 16, p. 206, and ibid. p. 207.

[12] See particularly, Lib. v. cap. 26, finem libri, pp. 323—337, where he proves the destruction of the Roman monarchy, the wickedness of antichrist, and the millenniary kingdom about to take place before the universal judgment, from the Revelation of Saint John.

[13] See Lib. iii. cap. 1. p. 174. Lib. ii. cap. 28, p. 156.

[14] See Lardner's *Credibility of the G. H.* vol. ii. pp. 164—166.

[15] See Lib. 1. cap. 3, p. 17, and Lardner, l. cit. pp. 170, 171.

[16] Lib. ii. cap. 27, p. 155.

[17] Lib. iv. cap. 32, p. 270. From the first view it would appear to follow from this passage, that the copies of the sacred books were at that time exclusively in the hands of the teachers. In fact, it asserts only thus much, that they possessed the copies most to be depended on; for the passage referred to in the note immediately preceding, together with many other reasons, will not permit us to doubt, that the generality of Christians also possessed them in abundance. See Walch *On the Use of the Holy Scriptures.*

[18] See Lardner, *Credibility*, vol. ii. pp. 173—178, who has examined with much solidity the passages in which these writings are quoted.

4. *Athenagoras.*

Athenagoras, a philosopher and a native of Athens, is the most polished and elegant author of Christian antiquity; and in respect of style, excels even Origen. His two works, the *Apology or Petition for the Christians,* (πρεσβεια περι Χριστιανων,) and *A Treatise on the Resurrection of the Dead,* (περι αναστασεως των νεκρων,) are written in very pure Greek, and with much wit and eloquence. In the Apology, which he presented to the Emperor Marcus Antoninus,[1] he defended the Christians from the three crimes with which they were falsely accused, namely, atheism, incest, and anthropophagy. He shews, that it is evidently absurd to accuse of atheism, those who restore to the Divinity the honours and adoration of which he had been robbed by idols; or of incest, those who assert that even to look on a woman to lust after her is fornication; or of anthropophagy, those who never frequent the gladiatorial shows, who declare that the use of medicines tending to procure abortion is homicide, and that the exposing of children is infanticide. The whole book cannot be read but with pleasure. Every part clearly evinces that the author had accurately studied the best works of the Grecians, and was master of the style and courtly language proper in addresses to the great. He composed the treatise *On the Resurrection of the Dead,* with a view to defend the truth of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body, against the heathen philosophers. He proves, that such a resurrection is by no means impossible, and so little improbable, that even the mere consideration of the nature of man, and of the justice of God, must lead us to acknowledge it.

This view which Athenagoras had proposed to himself in his writings, did not allow him to cite passages from the Sacred Scriptures. On this account we discover in them (if we except a few passages in which he expresses his propositions in the same words as we find in the books of the New Testament[2]) only one single clear testimony, and this indeed for the authenticity of the First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. Since the passage is too long, I will only extract the parts which my present purpose requires. In the treatise *On the Resurrection of the Dead,*[3] he avails himself of the proof taken from the fortunes of men, in general, and particularly of the virtuous, in this life. "The justice of God," he infers, "rendering it necessary to reward men as men, that is, as beings which consist not only of a soul, but also of a body, accurately according to their actions; and this reward rarely occurring in the present life;" it is therefore manifest that, according to the assertion of the apostle, "this corruptible and earthly must put on incorruption,—that every one may receive justly according to what he has done in the body, whether it be good or bad."[4] And, in chap. xix. p. 332, he had evidently the passage of Saint Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 32, in his mind: "If no future judgment be held on the actions of men, men are nothing better than beasts. Nay they are more miserable than other animals who struggle with their passions and strive after righteousness, and the fear of God, or other virtues. If there be no judgment, then the wild, bestial life is the best; then virtue is folly, and the fear of punishment ridiculous; then the enjoyment of every pleasure is the highest good, and that principle, so pleasant to the votaries of luxury and lust, Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die, the first rule of life." Since he here appeals expressly to an apostle, who had promulgated the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, yet without mentioning either his name or his writings; and adopts in his proof the same sentiments which we still find in the writings of that apostle; we shall not certainly presume too far, if we thence conclude, that at the time of Athenagoras, the two Epistles of Saint Paul to the Corinthians were generally known among the Christians, and considered as the source of their faith.

5. *Theophilus of Antioch.*

Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch,[1] considering the object which he had in view, could only mention the Sacred Scriptures occasionally. In his "Three Books to Autolycus," he disputes with a heathen, whom he wished to prepare for a nearer examination of the Christian religion, by first refuting the accusations which had been thrown out, that the tenets of the Christians were absurd, and their conduct detestable for incest and anthropophagy. Notwithstanding this, we find the Gospels of

---

[1] This is proved, in opposition to Bayle, in the Preface to the above mentioned (p. 23, note [1]) edition of the works of Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus of Antioch, p. cxiii.

[2] They are collected by Lardner, *Credibility of the G. H.* vol. ii. pp. 182—186.

[3] Cap. xviii.—finem libri, pp. 330—336.

[4] Ευδηλον, ——— *ὁτι δει κατα τον αποστολον, το φθαρτον τουτο και διασκεδαστον ενδυσασθαι αφθαρσιαν, ινα —— ἑκαστος κομισηται δικαιως, ἁ δια του σωματος επραξεν, ειτε αγαθα, ειτε κακα.* Cap. xviii, p. 331. The similitude of this passage to Saint Paul's assertions, 1 Cor. xv. 53, 2 Cor. v. 10, is very remarkable; *δει γαρ το φθαρτον τουτο ενδυσασθαι αφθαρσιαν,—ινα κομισηται ἑκαστος τα δια του σωματος, προς ἁ επραξεν, ειτε αγαθον, ειτε κακον.*

[1] For an account of this writer, see the Preface to the above mentioned Edition, p. cxx.

Saint Matthew and Saint John, the Epistle to the Romans, and the First to Timothy, quoted under the title of Divine Scriptures. In the third book, chap. xiii. p. 388, are recited various precepts of the Old Testament, which inculcate chastity and other virtues; he then adds,[2] "But the evangelical voice teaches chastity in yet greater perfection, when it says, 'Whosoever looketh on another man's wife to lust after her, has already committed adultery in his heart.' And it says farther, 'Whosoever marries one that is divorced, committeth adultery; and whosoever putteth away his wife, except on account of inchastity, committeth adultery,'" (Matth. v. 28, 32.) In the same book, chap. xiv. p. 389, "But the Gospel says,[3] 'Love your enemies, and pray for them that despitefully use you. For if you only love them that love you, what merit have you? Even robbers also, and tax-gatherers do this.'" In the second book, chap. xxii. p. 365, he quotes the passage in 1 John, i. 1, 3, with the following introduction:—"This is taught us by the Holy Scriptures, and by all those conducted by the Spirit, among whom John says,"[4] &c. With the title of the "Divine Doctrines," he quotes passages from Rom. xiii. 7, 8; 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.[5] And in the third book, chap. xii. p. 388, he says, "the commands of the prophets and evangelical writers are throughout concordant, because they have all spoken as inspired by the very same Spirit of God."[6]

We may apply to this author our previous observations on Justin Martyr, Tatian, and Athenagoras. Frequent quotations from the writings of Homer, Hesiod, Plato, Euripides, Aratus, &c. discovered that Theophilus was likewise a man of learning and cultivated talents.

6. *Clement of Alexandria.*

Clement, who was a teacher and presbyter at Alexandria, deserves even on this account the esteem of posterity; under his instruction was formed Origen, the most learned of all the fathers of the church. In his writings which are yet preserved,[1] he quotes all the books of the New Testament (except the Second Epistle of Saint Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of Saint John, the Epistle of Saint James, and the Epistle to Philemon,) so often by name, and so amply, that were I to extract all the citations, they would fill a volume.[2] To obtain a fundamental knowledge of the Christian religion, this author had travelled into Greece, Italy, Egypt, and Asia;[3] he was well acquainted with the writings of the earlier Christian teachers, Barnabas, Hermas, Clement, &c.;[4] he had examined the apocryphal books which then existed among the Christians, and compared them with the genuine works of the sacred writers.[5] All these circumstances evince that he did not give his assent to the Holy Scriptures until he had accurately examined them; and therefore afford considerable weight to his evidence for their authenticity.

7. *Tertullian.*

Tertullian, a presbyter at Carthage, is the most ancient of all the Latin Fathers whose works are now extant. His melancholy turn of mind, and the evil customs which began to prevail among Christians, induced him to embrace the fanatical doctrines of the Montanists. But his Montanism can by no means weaken his evidence for the historical truth of the New Testament; unless we conceive that a fanatic must necessarily lose all his organs of sense. Generally speaking, his tenets have no farther influence on his writings, than to occasion his preaching a too severe system of morality; and to shew that he revered Montanus and his prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla as inspired persons, through whom the Spirit of God had spoken. We have a great variety of his writings, which display much sacred and profane learning. But his style is extremely tedious, obscure, replete with Latin words of his own formation, entirely inharmonious, and not rarely bombastic. Cave asserts, in opposition to Lactantius,[1] that "it is lofty and masculine, and carries a kind of majestic eloquence along with it, that gives a pleasant relish to the judicious and inquisitive reader." But the decisions of this author on style and eloquence are as injudicious, as his historical information is unquestionable. That Tertullian was a man of talents, and well read in the classic works of antiquity, is undoubted.[2] But he had read, like many grammarians and modern editors, with the aid of the memory alone, but without taste or understanding. Lactantius is of the same opinion, "Tertullianus fuit omni genere literarum peritus, sed in eloquendo parum facilis et minus comptus, et multum obscurus fuit."

---

[2] Ἡ δε ευαγγελιος φωνη επιτατικωτερον διδασκει περι ἁγνειας λεγουσα.

[3] Το δε Ευαγγελιον λεγει.

[4] Ὀθεν διδασκουσιν ἡμας ἀι ἁγιαι γραφαι και παντες πνευματοφοροι, εξ ὡν Ιωαννης λεγει.

[5] Lib. iii. cap. xiv. p. 389. Ετι —— κελευει ἡμας ὁ θειος λογος.

[6] Διο το τους παντας πνευματοφορους ἑνι πνευματι Θεου λελαληκεναι.

[1] Namely, in the *Cohortatio ad gentes*, pp. 1—95; in the *Pædagogus*, pp. 96—314; in the eight books named *Stromata*, (that is, *Various Discourses*,) p. 934: and in the dissertation *Quis dives salvetur?* pp. 935—961, of the Edition of Bishop Potter, Oxford, 715, fol. See Le Nourry *Adparatus ad Bibliothecam maximam patrum*, tom. i. p. 624, seq. where the reader will meet with the most ample information concerning the writings of the Alexandrian Clement. Even in these works we find very evident proofs of the great injury which Christianity has suffered from its connection with the New-Platonic philosophy. See above, p. 22.

[2] Lardner has collected some examples on every book; *Credibility of the G. H.* vol. ii. pp. 210—330.

[3] In the *Stromata*, Lib. i. p. 322, he says, that his book was a short sketch of the discourses which he held with considerable persons in the above mentioned countries.

[4] He cites them often, and with great esteem; but he never pronounces them to be Divine Scriptures, as has been shewn by Lardner, l. cit. pp. 231—234.

[5] He frequently quotes passages from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel according to the Egyptians, the Preaching of Peter, the Revelation of Peter, the Traditions of Matthias; but he distinguishes them clearly enough from the genuine writings of the evangelists and apostles. See Lardner, l. cit. pp. 234—242. And even if we should grant that he considered the writings of Barnabas, Hermas, and Clement of Rome, and the Sibylline verses to be divine, yet this would not tend to invalidate the proof for the divinity of the Scriptures of the New Testament; for we use the testimonies of the ecclesiastical fathers, not in order to prove that these Scriptures are of divine original, but that they are genuine writings of the evangelists and apostles.

His works are filled with quotations by name, and long extracts from the writings of the New Testament. In the Apology for the Christians, which he delivered to the heathen magistracy at Carthage, he appeals, among other things, to the strict obedience and reverence of the Christians towards the Roman Emperors. "How can you suppose," says he,[3] "that we have no regard for the welfare of the Emperors? Behold only the word of God, our Scriptures, which we by no means keep secret, but which are even in the hands of our enemies. These command us,—to pray even for our enemies. The following precept also is found there expressly, Pray for kings, princes, and powers, that all things may proceed peaceably with you." Against Praxeas he quotes his proofs principally, as he expresses himself, from the New Testament, from the Gospels, and Apostles. "If I should not settle this dispute from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, I will take my proofs from the New Testament. For I perceive, both in the Gospels and the Apostles, that God is as well visible as invisible."[4] He mentions a Latin translation of those writings, but which did not always accurately express the meaning of the original text.[5] He treats copiously of the four Gospels, of Saint Matthew, of Saint Mark, Saint Luke, and Saint John, in a work against Marcion;[6] and proves their authenticity from numerous and credible evidences since the times of the apostles. He quotes, by name, every single book (the Epistle of Saint James, the Second Epistle of Saint Peter, and the Second and Third Epistles of Saint John, alone excepted) with the title of Divine Scriptures, and so often, that to prove it in this place by extracts from his works,[7] would be perfectly superfluous. I will mention only a single passage more, which will serve to shew how cautiously men acted at that time in examining the genuine apostolical writings. In his work against Heresies, "De præscriptione hæreticorum,"[8] he speaks with great confidence of the authenticity of the apostolical writings which were adopted as such by orthodox Christians. He appeals to the evidence of communities which the apostles had personally established, at Corinth, at Philippi, at Thessalonica, at Ephesus, and at Rome; whose members, on account of their intimate intercourse with the apostles, could assert with the greatest degree of certainty what writings actually emanated from them. "Age jam, qui voles curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis tuæ, percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsident; apud quas ipsæ authenticæ literæ eorum (their genuine works) recitantur.—Proxima est tibi Achaia? habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia; habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes in Asiam tendere: habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ adjaces; habes Romam; unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est."

SECT. III. — EVIDENCES FROM WORKS OF THE SECOND CENTURY, WHICH ARE NOW LOST.

The enemies of our religion complain often and loudly of the loss of those writings against Christianity which were composed by its ancient opponents; and some of them accuse the Christians, in language by no means doubtful, of having been the cause of the destruction of these works. But they do not take into consideration, that of the writings also of the ancient friends and defenders of Christianity many more have been lost than have been preserved. And that, together with these writings, many important evidences for the authenticity of the New Testament have also perished. We have already[1] regretted this loss when we treated above of the history of the first century. In the second this deficiency is still greater and more to be lamented.

1. Concerning Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, Eusebius gives us the following information:[2]—He wrote seven epistles to different Christian communities, and another to a Christian

---

[1] *Histor. Literar. Scriptor. Ecclesiasticator.*

[2] I quote here the edition of his works by Nicolaus Rigaltius, Paris, 1641, fol.

[3] *Apologeticus*, p. 30.

[4] *Adversus Praxeam*, p. 646. De Novo Testamento sumam confirmationem. In Evangeliis et in Apostolis visibilem et invisibilem Deum deprehendo.

[5] *De Monogamia*, p. 684.

[6] *Adversus Marcionem*, lib. iv. pp. 502, 503.

[7] The reader will find examples in Lardner's *Credibility of the G. H.* vol. ii. pp. 256—277. Or the truth of the assertion may be seen still more clearly from the list of scriptural passages quoted by Tertullian, which is contained in the above mentioned edition, pp. 766—795. And we cannot discover the least trace, that he had received any other book as divine, or as a genuine writing of the evangelists and apostles. See Lardner, pp. 284, 285.

[8] Cap. 36, p. 245. Lardner has very well cleared up this obscure passage. *Credibility*, vol. ii. pp. 266—269.

[1] Book ii. chap. 1.

[2] Eusebii. *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iv. cap. 23, pp. 184—187, edit. Reading.

matron: in the epistle to the community at Athens he exhorted men to believe and to act according to the Gospel: in the epistle to the Nicomedians he defended the true canon (or, as others translate it, the rule of truth, *τῳ της αληθειας ϖαριϛαται κανονι*,) in opposition to the heresy of Marcion: in the epistle to the church at Amastris he had inserted expositions of the Divine Scriptures. All these epistles are now lost; and with them much important information, and many weighty evidences for the authenticity of the New Testament.

2. In the work of Tatian, which still remains,[3] we find (on account of the particular purpose for which it was composed,) few allusions to the apostolical writings. But of these he had treated so much the more amply in his Harmony, or *Δια Τεσσαρων*, a gospel composed from the four Gospels taken together. This work was well known to Eusebius;[4] and although the author might have inserted his heretical principles even here, yet the loss of this work is greatly to be lamented, as well for many other causes as on account of its great antiquity.[5] Irenæus,[6] and Clement of Alexandria,[7] allude to other writings of this author, in which he attempted to prove some of his heterodox tenets by quotations from the First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians.

3. Hegesippus, a convert from Judaism, composed five books of ecclesiastical history, in which he gave an account of the apostolical preaching."[8] But of this work we have nothing remaining except a few fragments preserved by Eusebius and Photius. Although the historian might not have entirely laid aside that credulity and inclination for the fabulous, which was peculiar to the Jews of his time, (and that this was the case is plain from the extracts in the above mentioned authors,) nevertheless, the loss of his work is much to be lamented; because there undoubtedly existed in it much material information for a history of the scriptural writings, which he must have collected in his intercourse with many considerable teachers of Christianity. However, we discover from the fragments, that he was very well acquainted with the Scriptures of the New Testament; for he quotes them often, although not by name; and his manner of writing is invariably in that peculiarity of style belonging to these books.[9]

4. Melito, Bishop of Sardis, has rendered himself remarkable in ecclesiastical history, particularly by his examination of the sacred books of the Old Testament.[10] He composed various writings, of which we scarcely know more than the titles, as they are given to us in Eusebius.[11] His books, "On the Conduct of Christians,"—"Of the Prophets,"—"Of the Church,"—"On the Lord's Day,"—"Of Obedience to the Gospel — *ϖερι ὑπακοης ϖιϛεως*," — "On the Conception and Birth of Christ — *ϖερι κλισεως και γενεσεως Χριϛου*," — "On the Revelation of Saint John," — and "On the Incarnation of God — *ϖερι ἐνσωματου Θεου*," contained probably more particular information concerning the apostolical writings. From the few fragments of his works we can produce him only as an evidence for the high antiquity of the Revelation of Saint John; yet even this is of dubious import, as we have no information concerning the contents of his treatise on this subject."[12]

5. Of the terrible persecutions which the Christians in Gaul suffered in the time of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus, we find a very affecting relation in the epistle which the communities at Vienne and Lyons, in France, sent on this account to the Christians in Asia. Eusebius has preserved a great part of it in his "Ecclesiastical History."[13] The sufferings of the Christians, the patience, cheerfulness, and steadfast behaviour of the martyrs, are described by sentiments and expressions which are taken from the Scriptures of the New Testament. — "Then was the saying of the Lord fulfilled, 'The time will come when whosoever killeth you will think that he doth God service,'" (John, xvi. 2.) "They (namely, the martyrs) prayed for their executioners, as did the holy Stephen, 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge,'" (Acts, vii. 50.) "They endeavoured to follow the example of Christ, 'Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal to God,'" (Phil. ii. 6.) "He (a martyr of the name of Vettius Epagathus) was a true disciple of Christ, 'following the Lamb whithersoever it goes,'" (Rev. xiv. 4.) When we reflect that this epistle was written by a community in which Irenæus, (who has desposed such ample evidence for the Scriptures of the New Testament, p. 24,) was at that time a Presbyter, we may without hesitation use these passages

---

[3] See above, p. 24.

[4] *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iv. cap. 29, pp. 193, 194.

[5] See Valesius in Eusebium, l. cit.

[6] Lib. iii. cap. 23, § 8, p. 222, ed. Massueti.

[7] *Stromat*, lib. iii. p. 547, Potteri.

[8] Eusebius *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iv. cap. 8, p. 150.

[9] See Lardner's *Credibility.*

[10] He travelled into Palestine, on purpose to obtain information on the true canon of the Old Testament. Eusebius has preserved his catalogue, *Hist. Ecc.* lib. iv. cap. 26, pp. 190, 191.

[11] *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iv. cap. 26, pp. 188, 189.

[12] The epistle of Melito to a person of the name of Onesimus, who was the cause of his journey into Palestine, begins thus, (Eusebius l. cit. p. 191.) "As you have often, from your love towards the divine doctrine, required of me that I should collect from the Law and the Prophets those passages which concern the Redeemer and our common faith; and as you were desirous of knowing accurately the Old Scriptures, their number, and the order in which they were composed, I have therefore inquired after the books of the Old Testament," &c. This passage appears to prove, that at that time existed also a second collection of sacred books, under the name of the New Testament. See Lardner, l. cit. p. 148.

[13] Lib. v. cap. 1, 2, 3, 4, p. 198, seq.

as proofs of the antiquity of the Gospel of Saint John, of the Acts of the Apostles by Saint Luke, of the Epistle to the Romans and Philippians, and of the Revelation of Saint John; although these books are not quoted by name.

6. Miltiades, one of the apologists for Christianity, was, according to the information of Eusebius,[14] well skilled in the Divine Scriptures and Christian theology. He had given convincing proofs of his erudition in a book which he wrote against the Montanists with this title, *περι του μη δειν προφητην εν εκστασει λαλειν*, "That it does not become prophets to speak in ecstasy;" and in his works against the Jews and Gentiles,[15] — "He has also left us," says Eusebius, "as well in his writings against the Gentiles, as in those against the Jews, monuments of his zeal for the divine books." Without doubt, therefore, he had copiously used the authorities of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.

7. I have produced Theophilus of Antioch above (p. 26) as an evidence for the authenticity of the Gospels of Saint Matthew and Saint John, of the Epistle to the Romans, and also of the First Epistle to Timothy. Did the work which he wrote against Hermogenes, *προς την αιρεσιν Ερμογενους*, still exist, we might likewise prove from him the antiquity of the Revelation of Saint John.[16]

8. Pantænus, whom Eusebius,[17] apparently by mistake, mentions as president of the catechetical school at Alexandria, was, as this author infoms us, such a faithful and learned supporter of Christianity, that he would have instructed posterity as usefully by his writings, as he did his contemporaries by his sermons. He preached the Gospel in India,[18] and is said to have found there the Gospel of Saint Matthew in the Hebrew language[19] Whether this information, which Eusebius gives in a doubtful manner, be true or not, nevertheless it proves thus much, that the Gospel of Saint Matthew was already known in the earliest ages. According to Jerome's relation,[20] he composed also certain commentaries on the Bible.

9. The work of Clement of Alexandria, in which he principally considered the Holy Scriptures of the Christians, his *Hypotuposes*, is also lost, except a few fragments. It contained explications of many books both of the Old and New Testament, especially of the Epistles of Saint Paul, and of the Catholic Epistles.[21] Eusebius has preserved the following information from it,[22] — That the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by Saint Paul in the Hebrew language, and translated into Greek by Saint Luke his companion; that the Gospels which contain the Genealogies (namely, of Saint Matthew and Saint Luke) were composed before the others; that Saint Mark wrote his Gospel at the request of Saint Peter's disciples at Rome, and that Saint Peter was so far from rejecting it, that, at the instigation of the Holy Ghost, he imparted a divine consequence to it;[23] and that Saint John had written *πνευματικον ευαγγελιον*, a Gospel which treated especially of the divine nature of Christ, the others being principally employed on his human. *Τον . . . Ιωαννην εσχατον συνιδοντα, οτι τα σωματικα εν τοις ευαγγελιοις δεδηλωται, προτραπεντα υπο των γνωριμων πνευματι θεοφορηθεντα πνευματικον ποιησαι ευαγγελιον.*

Eusebius and Jerome would have performed still greater service to posterity, had they made longer and more complete extracts from those writings of considerable teachers which existed in their times. Both of them notice various teachers of the second century who had written commentaries on the scriptural books. But as they are silent on their contents, we can neither determine what information these writers gave, nor on what books of the Bible they had employed their labours.[24]

---

[14] *Hist. Eccles.* lib. v. cap. 17, pp. 232, 233.

[15] See Eusebius, l. cit. In the first work he had undoubtedly made mention of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Compare the remark of Valesius in loc. cit.

[16] See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iv. cap. 24, p. 287, who says, that Theophilus, in the above mentioned book, had taken some of his proofs from the Revelation of Saint John, *εν ᾧ εκ της αποκαλυψεως Ιωαννου κεχρηται μαρτυριαις.*

[17] *Hist. Eccles.* lib. v. cap. 10, pp. 222, 223. See Lardner's *Credibility*, vol. ii. p. 203.

[18] The old ecclesiastical historians mean frequently by this name Arabia Felix; see Michaelis *Intr. to the N. T.* vol. iii. p. 124, of the learned Mr Marsh's trans.; but here it is India properly so called, India on the Ganges. Christianity was preached there in the first century by the Apostle Saint Thomas. This is asserted, 1. By the ancient writers consulted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 1, v. 10 — 2. By the most learned historians of the East, Asseman Bibl. Orient. tom. iii. par. i. p. 611, and par. ii. p. 25 — and, 3. By those Christian sects which have existed from the most early antiquity in India, particularly on the coasts of Malabar, who have an ancient tradition to the same purpose, and therefore call themselves Saint Thomas's Christians.—La Croze, 38.

[19] Eusebius, l. cit. *ενθα λογος ἑυρειν αυτον —— το κατα Ματθαιον ευαγγελιον, κ. τ. λ.*

[20] Hujus multi —— in sanctam scripturam extant Commentarii. *De vir. Illustr.* cap. 36.

[21] Eusebius, *Hist Eccles.* lib. vi. cap. 14, p. 273, et Photius, *Biblioth. Codice* cix. p. 287, edit. Andr. Schotti. Rothomagi, 1653, folio.

[22] Loc. cit.

[23] Loc. cit. Comp. lib. ii. cap. 15, p. 64. *Γνοντα δε το πραχθεν* (namely, that Saint Mark had composed in writing the speeches of Saint Peter at the request of the Romans) *φασι τον Αποστολον* (Saint Peter) *αποκαλυψαντος αυτῳ του Πνευματος ἡσθηναι τῃ των ανδρων προθυμια, κυρωσαι τε την γραφην* (the Gospel of Saint Mark) *εις εντευξιν ταις εκκλησιαις.* The sentence *αποκαλυψαντος αυτῳ του Πνευματος* has been always referred by translators to the preceding words; but if it be construed with those which follow, every difficulty will vanish, — "Peter, having discovered what had been done, and being instigated by the Holy Ghost, granted the desire of those men, (the Romans,) and gave his sanction to the Gospel of Saint Mark, that it should be read in the Christian communities." Lardner torments himself with the difficulty of this passage, *Credibility*, vol. ii. p. 215; but amidst all his observations, he has not reflected that the structure of the words in Eusebius does not by any means necessitate the connection of *αποκαλυψ. κ. τ. λ.* with *γνοντα —— Αποστολον*: as if the Holy Ghost had revealed to Saint Peter, that the Romans had petitioned Saint Mark to compose his Gospel, and that he had granted their request.

CHAP. III.

WITNESSES IN THE THIRD CENTURY.

SECT. I. EVIDENCES OF WITNESSES IN THE THIRD CENTURY.

Before I introduce the complete catalogues, which Origen and Eusebius have left us, of those writings which the Christians of the first century held as genuine works of the evangelists and apostles, and venerated as divine books, I will cursorily mention some other witnesses who lived in the beginning of the third century, but whose writings have not descended to us.

1. *Caius Romanus.*

Caius, who was a presbyter of the church of Rome, and a most learned man, quotes in his dialogue with Proculus, a follower of Montanus, all the epistles which we have at present under the name of Saint Paul, as genuine works of this apostle, except the Epistle to the Hebrews, which he has omitted to enumerate among the rest. We find this information in an extract which Eusebius has preserved from this work which no longer exists.[1]

2. *Hippolytus Portuensis.*

From the fragments which we still possess of the works[1] of Hippolytus Portuensis, we are led to belive that he was a learned man; and the conciseness, solidity, and force with which he wrote, clearly prove that he far excelled all the writers of his time. In support of this I shall quote a single passage,[2] which, if not an adequate testimony for the authenticity of our four Gospels, will at least demonstrate the truth of the history related in them. Hippolytus is proving that Jesus was both perfect man, and perfect God. "His humanity," says he, "may be easily perceived, by the circumstances of his feeling hunger, and fatigue, and thirst; by his fearfully fleeing, and anxiously praying; by his sleeping on a pillow; his imploring for the removal of the cup of sorrow; his sweating from fear of death, and his being strengthened by an angel; by his being betrayed by Judas, mocked by Caiaphas and Herod, scourged by Pilate, insulted by the soldiers, and crucified by the Jews; his commending with a loud voice his spirit to the Father; his bending his head and giving up the ghost; having his side pierced by a spear, being laid, wrapped up in fine linen, in the grave, and raised up on the third day by the Father. His divinity may be easily discovered, since he was worshipped by angels, visited by shepherds, expected by Simeon; he received the testimony of Anna, was visited by the Magi, and announced by a star; he changed water into wine at the marriage feast, calmed the stormy sea, walked upon the water, gave sight to one born blind, raised Lazarus to life, who had been dead four days, and performed many other miracles, forgiving sins, and imparting miraculous powers to his apostles." As early as the time of Eusebius this writer was so little known, that men were even ignorant of what place he was bishop.[3] And scholars of the present day, after having examined all the documents of antiquity, remain still uncertain whether we possess any writings which can be safely attributed to him.[4] We do not even know whether he lived in Italy or in Arabia; whether he was a divine or a statesman.[5]

---

[24] We can make no use of the spurious writings of this century for our present purpose.—1. The Acts of Paul and of Thecla attribute indeed many of the same sentiments to the Apostle Saint Paul, as exist in the books of our New Testament; but it is uncertain whether this be the same work which is mentioned by the Ecclesiastical Fathers. (Lardner's *Credibility*, vol. ii. p. 310.) — 2. The Sibylline Oracles were forged in all probability about the second century. They also relate (in prophecy, as they pretend) almost every single event of the evangelical history; but they do not mention, either expressly or by name, any of the writings of the New Testament. Lardner, l. cit. p. 313, seq. — 3. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs speak often in the language of the New Testament; but it is most uncertain whether this writing be of that early antiquity which many scholars imagine. Origen quotes a work under this title; but how can it be proved that the work which we still possess is the very same? Lardner, l. cit. p. 324, seq. — 4. The Recognitions of Clement, (see Cotelerii *Patres Apostol.* vol. i. p. 483, seq.) which contain Disputations of the Apostle Saint Peter with Simon Magus, and mention other discourses, and a variety of miracles by the same apostle.—5. The Clementine Homilies, which are almost of the very same tenor, and in all probability are the ground-work from which, after many additions and improvements, arose the work mentioned above, in No. 4. (Cotelerius, l. cit. p. 603, seq.)—And, 6. The Clementine Epitome, a compilation out of the Recognitions and Homilies, (Cotelerius, l. cit. p. 755, seq.) These three works, to which the venerable name of Clement has been forged, contain merely similar expressions and sentiments, but not a single quotation, either expressly or by name, from the books of our New Testament. Extracts from the above mentioned writings may be seen in Lardner, l. cit. p. 342, seq.

[1] *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vi. cap. 20. p. 285.

[1] Joh. Albert Fabricius has collected these fragments, and published them together with the other works attributed to him, at Hamburg, 1716, 2 vols. folio.

[2] It has been preserved by Theodoret. See Fabricii Hippolyt. vol. i. p. 268.

[3] Ἱππολυτος, ἑτερας — προεϛως εκκλησιας· *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vi. cap. 20, p. 284.

[4] See Mill's *Prolegomena in N. T.* Num. 655, et Fabricius *Præfat. in Hippol.*

[5] Some believe that he was bishop of Porto, in Italy; others, of Portus Romanus, in Arabia Felix. See Fabricius, l. cit. Heumann asserts, that he was not a spiritual, but a temporal επισκοπος.

3. *Ammonius.*

Ammonius (whom Eusebius and Jerome suppose to have been the celebrated Alexandrian philosopher Ammonius Saccas,) composed a Harmony of the Four Gospels, in which he had used the Gospel of Saint Matthew as a foundation.[1] That which we possess at present under his name is, if not entirely forged, at least very much mutilated.[2] I therefore reckon this work among the lost writings of antiquity, and would proceed directly to the catalogues of Origen, but have yet to remark, that

4. *Julius Africanus,*

Who flourished in the beginning of this century, has afforded an evidence for the authenticity of the Gospels of Saint Matthew and Saint Luke, in the epistle to Aristides, in which he endeavours to remove the apparent contradiction in the genealogy of Christ as delivered by these Evangelists.[3]

5. *Origen.*

Origen, the most learned and laborious of all the fathers, who was in such high estimation even among the heathen philosophers, that they dedicated their writings to him, and transmitted them to him for his revisal,[1] has particularly distinguished himself by his labours on the biblical writings. He not only composed a celebrated critical work on the Old Testament, but wrote also a threefold exposition of the books of the whole Bible; *Scholia*, or short notes; *Tomes*, or extensive commentaries, in which he employed all his learning, critical, sacred, and profane; and *Tracts*, or homilies to the people.[2] Of these only a small portion is come down to us, and that for the most part in Latin translations made by Jerome or Rufinus; the rest have been destroyed by the ravages of time.

He is the first who has given us a perfect catalogue of those books which Christians unanimously, or at least the major part of them, have considered as genuine writings of the apostles, and as works of divine inspiration. In his thirteenth homily upon Genesis,[3] he discovers in the servants of Isaac, who dug cisterns, a type of the scriptural writers. "His servants," says he, "are Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; his servants also are Peter, James, Jude, and the Apostle Paul, who all dig the wells of the New Testament." In the same manner he allegorizes[4] the history of Joshua, in his seventh homily on this book.[5] "When our Lord Jesus Christ came, of whom that son of Nave was a type, he sent forth the priests, his apostles, with trumpets, from which they sounded the heavenly doctrine. Matthew sounds first with his priestly trumpet in his Gospel. Mark also, and Luke, and John, sounded each his own trumpet. In like manner Peter sounds aloud with the two trumpets of his epistles; as does James also, and Jude. John sounds again with his trumpet in his Epistles and in the Revelation, and Luke in his Acts of the Apostles. Last of all appeared he who said of himself, 'and last of all God appointed me an apostle,' and thundered with the trumpets of his fourteen epistles so powerfully, that the walls of Jericho, and all the machines of superstition, and the doctrines of the philosophers fell to the ground."

The passages here quoted are extant at present only in the Latin version. Eusebius has been at the pains to collect in a particular chapter,[6] the catalogue of the books of the New Testament from the works of Origen. From his Commentary upon the Gospel of Saint Matthew he copies the following passage, which determines what histories of the life of Jesus were universally received among the Christians:—"I have learnt by tradition (the evidences of antiquity) concerning the four Gospels, which are exclusively received without dispute by the whole Church of God under heaven, that the first was written by Saint Matthew, who composed it in the Hebrew language for the use of the proselytes from Judaism; the second by Saint Mark; the third by Saint Luke; and the last by Saint John." Concerning the epistles of the apostles, the historian gives us from the "Commentaries upon Saint John's Gospel," and the "Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews," the following information:—"Saint Paul did not write to all the communities which he himself had established, and the epistles which he did write are not long. Saint Peter has left one epistle universally acknowledged, the second also ought not to be entirely excluded from the number of his works, because the matter is still doubtful. Saint John has written a Gospel, the Revelation, and a short epistle. The second and third epistles ought not to be entirely rejected, since they were considered by various people as genuine works of Saint John. The Epistle to the Hebrews could not well come from Saint Paul, because the Greek in which it is written is more elegant than that of the other epistles of this apostle. In all probability the subject-matter was furnished by Saint Paul, but the construction of the words is the work of some other person who recorded the thoughts of the apostle, and illustrated them with various remarks." This is Origen's review of the writings of the New Testament; I will insert below the whole passage of Eusebius, from which I have here only extracted certain parts.[7] Whoever desires to receive farther information of this teacher's evidences for the New Testament, may consult Lardner's *Credibility*, in which this article is treated with most particular attention.

---

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vi. cap. 19, p. 282. Ejusd. epistola ad Carpianum, which is prefixed to his *Harmony*. Hieronymus, *De vir. Illustr.* cap. 55.

[2] See Wetstein, *Prolegom. ad N. T.* tom. i. p. 65, seq. Comp. Lardner's *Credibility*, vol. ii. p. 413, and the following pages.

[3] See the extract from the above mentioned epistle in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. i. cap. 7, pp. 21—25.

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vi. cap. 19, p. 279.

[2] Hieronymus, Prolegom. in Ezechiel. He superintended also a very accurate edition of the whole New Testament, Hieronymus in Matth. xxiv. 36. Origenes in Joan. 1. Comp. Ernesti De Origene interpr. gr. auct.—in the Opusc. Theol. p. 306, seq.

[3] Operum, tom. ii. p. 95, edit. De la Rue.

[4] Concerning this pernicious and absurd mode of interpretation, see above, p. 22.

[5] Oper. tom. ii. p. 412.

[6] Cap. 25, lib. vi. pp. 289—292. The title of the chapter is, *ὁπως των ενδιαθηκων γραφων εμνημονευσε*, namely, Origen.

SECT. II. — INFORMATION COLLECTED BY EUSEBIUS FROM THE WORKS OF THE THREE FIRST CENTURIES.

Had the writers of the two first centuries possessed the same anxious care for posterity which Origen evinced, we should have been able to prove the authenticity of the books of the New Testament with greater ease and more satisfaction. Yet Eusebius has, in a certain degree, supplied the loss. This father of ecclesiastical history assures us that he had read the works of Christian antiquity with great diligence, and especially with the view of ascertaining what writings had been received since the origin of Christianity as genuine works of the evangelists and apostles. He imparts the result of this inquiry in several particular chapters of his *Ecclesiastical History*. In the third book[1] he treats of the Epistles of the Apostles; respecting which he had found in the works of the first and second centuries the following information:—"That the First Epistle of Saint Peter has always been universally received as divine; but that called his Second Epistle, although not received as divine, *ενδιαθηκος*, has nevertheless been carefully studied as an useful work. That the fourteen epistles which go under the name of Saint Paul, have been universally revered as divine Scriptures, except that some have doubted concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews, because the Romish Church did not consider it to be the work of Saint Paul.[2] That Saint Luke, a physician, has left us two books, divinely inspired, namely, a Gospel, and the Acts of the Apostles; and that many of the ancients were of opinion, that Saint Paul means this gospel whenever he speaks of some gospel of his (Saint Paul's) own. That the Gospels were written in the following order of time; Saint Matthew's first of all for the Hebrews, and in the Hebrew language; then Saint Mark's, which was composed at the request of the Christians at Rome; afterwards that of Saint Luke, who was induced to undertake it from the spurious gospels which were at that time in circulation; and that last of all Saint John had perused the three preceding, and confirmed them; yet, as they related only the actions of Christ which took place after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, he therefore had thought it necessary to write his Gospel, and supply in it what was wanting in the others: and that he in particular had received the matter concerning the divinity of Christ from the Holy Ghost. That besides this Gospel, the first Epistle, which bears the name of Saint John, has been universally ascribed to him both by ancients and moderns; that the second and third Epistles were rejected by some; and that the majority were perfectly in doubt concerning the Revelation."[3]

---

[7] Loc. cit. pp. 290, 291. *Εν δε τῳ ϖρωτῳ των εις το κατα Ματθαιον ευαγγελιον, τον εκκλησιαϛικον φυλαττων κανονα, μονα τεσσαρα ειδεναι ευαγγελια μαρτυρεται, ὡδε ϖως γραφων· ὡς εν ϖαραδοσει μαθων ϖερι των τεσσαρων ευαγγελιων, ἁ και μονα αναντιῤῥητα εϛιν εν τῃ ὑπο τȣ ȣρανȣ εκκλησιᾳ τȣ Θεȣ· ὁτι ϖρωτον μεν γεγραπται το κατα τον ϖοτε τελωνην, ὑϛερον δε αποϛολον Ιησȣ Χριϛȣ Ματθαιον, εκδεδωκοτα αυτο τοις απο Ιȣδαϊσμȣ ϖιϛευσασι, γραμμασιν ἑϐραϊκοις συντεταγμενον· δευτερον δε το κατα Μαρκον, ὡς Πετρος ὑφηγησατο αυτῳ ϖοιησαντα, ὁν και ὑιον εν τῃ καθολικῃ επιϛολῃ δια τουτων ὡμολογησε φασκων, ασπαζεται ὑμας ἡ εν Βαϐυλωνι συνεκλεκτη, και Μαρκος, ὁ ὑιος μȣ· και τριτον το κατα Λουκαν, το ὑπο Παυλȣ επαινουμενον ευαγγελιον, τοις απο των εθνων ϖεποιηκοτα· επι ϖασι το κατα Ιωαννην· και εν τῳ ϖεμπτῳ δε των εις το κατα Ιωαννεν εξηγητικων, ὁ αυτος ταυτα ϖερι των επιϛολων των Αποϛολων φησιν· ὁ δε ἱκανωθεις διακονος γενεσθαι της καινης διαθηκης ȣ γραμματος αλλα ϖνευματος Παυλος· ὁ ϖεπληρωκως το ευαγγελιον απο Ἱερουσαλημ και κυκλῳ μεχρι τȣ Ιλλυρικȣ, ουδε ϖασαις εγραψεν, ἁις εδιδαξεν εκκλησιαις· αλλα και ἁις εγραψεν, ολιγους ϛιχους επεϛειλε· Πετρος δε εφ' ᾡ οικοδομειται ἡ Χριϛȣ εκκλησια, ἡς ϖυλαι ᾁδȣ ȣ κατισχυσουσι, μιαν επιϛολην ὁμολογουμενην καταλελοιπεν· εϛω δε και δευτεραν, αμφιϐαλλεται γαρ. τι δει ϖερι του αναπεσοντος λεγειν επι το ϛηθος του Ιησȣ, Ιωαννω; ὁς ευαγγελιον ἑν καταλελοιπεν, ὁμολογων δυνασθαι τοσαυτα ϖοιησειν, ἁ ουδε ὁ κοσμος χωρησαι εδυνατο· εγραψε δε και την αποκαλυψιν, κελευθεις σιωπησαι και μη γραψαι τας των ἑπτα βροντων φωνας· καταλελοιπε δε και επιϛολην ϖανυ ολιγων ϛιχων· εϛω δε και δευτεραν και τριτην· επει ȣ ϖαντες φασι γνησιους ειναι ταυτας· ϖλην ȣκ εισι ϛιχων αμφοτεραι ἑκατον· ετι ϖρος τουτοις ϖερι της ϖρος Ἑϐραιους επιϛολης εν ταις εις αυτην ὁμιλιαις ταυτα διαλαμϐαναι· ὁτι ὁ χαρακτηρ της λεξεως της ϖρος Εϐραιους επιγεγραμμενης επιϛολης, ουκ εχει το εν λογῳ ιδιωτικον τȣ Αποϛολȣ, ὁμολογησαντος ἑαυτον ιδιωτην ειναι τῳ λογῳ τουτ' εϛι τῃ φρασει· αλλα εϛιν ἡ επιϛολη συνθεσει της λεξεως Ἑλληνικωτερα, ϖας ὁ επιϛαμενος κρινειν φρασεων διαφορας, ὁμολογησαι αν· ϖαλιν τε αν ὁτι τα νοηματα της επιϛολης θαυμασια εϛι, και ου δευτερα των Αποϛολικων ὁμολογουμενων γραμματων, και τȣτο αν συμφησαι ειναι αληθες, ϖας ὁ ϖροσεχων τῃ αναγνωσει τῃ Αποϛολικῃ· τουτοις μεθ' ἑτερα επιφερει λεγων. εγω δε αποφαινομενος ειποιμ' ἀν, ὁτι τα μεν νοηματα τȣ Αποϛολȣ εϛιν ἡ δε φρασις και ἡ συνθεσις, απομνημονευσαντος τινος τα αποϛολικα, και ὡσπερει σχολιογραφησαντος τα ειρημενα ὑπο τȣ διδασκαλȣ· ει τις ȣν εκκλησια εχει ταυτην επιϛολην ὡς Παυλȣ, ἁυτη ευδοκιμειτο και επι τȣτῳ· ȣ γαρ εικῃ ὁι αρχαιοι ανδρες ὡς Παυλȣ ϖαραδεδωκασι· τις δε ὁ γραψας την επιϛολην, το μεν αληθες Θεος ειδει.*

[1] Caps. 3, 4, and 24, pp. 89—92, and 115—118.

[2] *Τινες ηθετηκασι την ϖρος Εϐραιȣς, ϖρος της Ῥωμαιων εκκλησιας ὡς μη Παυλȣ ȣσαν αυτην αντιλεγεσθαι φησαντες·*

[3] *Ἡ ϖροτερα των επιϛολων ϖαρα τε τοις νυν και τοις ετι αρχαιοις αναμφιλεκτος ὡμολογηται· αντιλεγονται δε ἁι λοιπαι δυο της δ' αποκαλυψεως εφ' ἑκατερον ετι νυν ϖαρα τοις ϖολλοις*

Eusebius has given the most perfect account of this subject in the twenty-fifth chapter of the third book,[4] in which he collects and lays before the reader the result of the information contained in detached parts of the preceding books.

In this he delivers not his own private opinion, but the opinion of the Church, *εκκλησιαστικη παραδωσις*, the sum of what he had found in the writings of the primitive Christians. The cited passage contains consequently the opinion of the whole Christian Church during the three first centuries; and a proper insight into its meaning is of great importance to us. Eusebius unites the *νοθαι γραφαι* (those writings which were actually spurious, or thought such) with the *αντιλεγομεναι* (the doubtful.) After having spoken of the *αντιλεγομεναι*, he immediately adds, *εν τοις νοθοις και κατατεταχθω των Παυλου πραξεων η γραφη, ὁ, τε λεγομενος Ποιμην*, "among the spurious are to be reckoned the Acts of Paul, the Shepherd," &c. Whence it appears to me clear, that he speaks in this passage of the anthenticity of the books, whether they are genuine or spurious, and not of their divine inspiration. Again, he calls the *ὁμολογουμεναι γραφαι* (universally received books) also, *αληθεις και απλαστοι*, genuine and not forged; and opposes them to those which were falsely attributed to the apostles, *ταις ονοματι των Αποστολων προφερομεναις*. He places the Revelation of Saint John also under the *νοθα* or *αντιλεγομενα*, for this reason, because the majority of the ancients doubted whether they should consider it as the writing of Saint John the Apostle, or of some other person, consequently as genuine or spurious. Lastly, he also classes the Shepherd of Hermas, the Revelation of Peter, the Acts of Paul, and the Epistle of Barnabas, under the *νοθα* (or, *αντιλεγομενα*.) Now, among the ancients none ever thought these books divine,[5] but their authenticity indeed has been called in question.

These arguments evince, if I mistake not, that Eusebius speaks here of the authenticity, not of the divine inspiration, of those writings which existed in his time under the names of the apostles, evangelists, and apostolical men. His intention in this place is not to mention what writings were considered as divine, but to ascertain the three following points: —1. What writings were received by the ancients as genuine works of the apostles, evangelists, and apostolical men; 2. Of what writings the authenticity had been called in question; and, 3. Those which were entirely rejected as spurious.

On these points the opinion of the three first centuries was as follows:—

I. *Ὁμολογουμεναι γραφαι* (*ανωμολογημεναι*; or, *αληθεις και απλαστοι*,) writings which were universally received as the genuine works of the persons whose names they bear.

In this class Eusebius reckons,—1. The four Gospels; 2. The Acts of the Apostles; 3. The Epistles of Saint Paul; 4. The First Epistle of Saint John; 5. The First Epistle of Saint Peter. The Revelation of Saint John might also perhaps be placed in this class, because some think its authenticity incontrovertible, yet the majority leave the matter undetermined.[6]

II. *Αντιλεγομεναι*, writings on whose authenticity the ancients were not unanimous; which some held to be supposititious.[7]

According to Eusebius, even these have the majority of voices among the ancients in their favour. He expressly calls them, *γνωριμα ὁμως τοις πολλοις* (writings acknowledged by most to be genuine,) and *παρα πλειστοις των εκκλησιαστικων γιγνωσκομενα* (received by the majority.) A few doubted of their authenticity, and therefore Eusebius ranks them under the contested, *αντιλεγομενα*, or *νοθα*.

In this class he enumerates, of the writings of the New Testament, 1. The Epistle of Saint James; 2. The Epistle of Saint Jude; 3. The Second Epistle of Saint Peter; 4. The Second and Third Epistles of Saint John. The Revelation of Saint John, he adds, is also by some placed in this class.[8]

And, of other writings, the Acts of Saint Paul, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Revelation of Saint Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Doctrines of the Apostles, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

III. *Ατοπα και δυσσεβη*, (absurd and impious;) writings which had been universally rejected as evidently spurious.

In this class he includes the Gospels of Peter, of Thomas, and of Matthias; the Acts of Andrew, of John, and of other apostles. These writings, says he, contain evident errors, are written in a style entirely different from that of the apostles, and have not been thought worthy of being mentioned by any one of the ancients.

περιελκεται ἡ δοξα. Loc cit. p. 118. But concerning the Revelation, "Even yet," (that is, notwithstanding all preceding inquiries,) "the majority are in doubt," (know not whether to hold it genuine or spurious.)

[4] The commencement of the chapter is as follows: *Ευλογον δ' ενταυθα γενομενους ανακεφαλαιωσασθαι τας δηλωθεισας της καινης διαθηκης γραφας.*

[5] See above, p. 15, note [12]

[6] See above, p. 33.

[7] He names these writings also *νοθαι γραφαι*, "spurious writings;" that is, according to the opinion of some. These *νοθαι* do not, therefore, compose a distinct class, as is the general supposition.

[8] For in early times some believed that this work was not composed by John the apostle, but by a presbyter of the same name, or by some other person. See the following 5th chapter of this book.

CHAPTER IV.

A SUMMARY RECAPITULATION OF THE EVIDENCES MENTIONED ABOVE.

I will now reduce into order the depositions of the witnesses, who have been already separately examined, and enable the reader to perceive at one view what has been the opinion of men during the first two centuries and half on each individual book of the New Testament.

I. *The Gospel by Saint Matthew*

Is pronounced to be a genuine work of the evangelist whose name it bears,—1. By Papias, 21;[1] 2. By many ancient writers of the first century, consulted by Eusebius, 21; 3. By Justin Martyr, 24; 4. Tatian, 29; 5. Irenæus, 25; 6. Athenagoras, 26; 7. Theophilus of Antioch, 27; 8. Clement of Alexandria, 27; 9. Tertullian, 28; 10. Ammonius, 32; 11. Julius Africanus, 32; 12. Origen, 32; and by all the primitive writers, without exception, whom Eusebius had read, 34.

And this may be inferred also, yet only with a degree of probability, from the writings of Barnabas, 13; Clement of Rome, 15; Ignatius, 19; and Polycarp, 20.[2]

II. *The Gospel by Saint Mark*

Is declared to be a genuine writing of the evangelist to whom it is ascribed, by,—1. Papias, 21; 2. Many ancient writers of the first century, consulted by Eusebius, 21; 3. Justin Martyr, 24; 4. Tatian, 29; 5. Irenæus, 25; 6. Clement of Alexandria, 27; 7. Tertullian, 28; 8. Ammonius, 32; 9. Origen, 32; and by all the ancients whom Eusebius had read, 34.

Clement of Rome, 15; and Ignatius, 19, were, probably, of the same opinion.[3]

III. *The Gospel and Acts of the Apostles by Saint Luke,*

Are adopted as the undeniable works of Saint Luke, the companion and disciple of Saint Paul, by,—1. The ancient writers of the first century, consulted by Eusebius, 21; 2. Justin Martyr, 24; 3. Tatian, 29; 4. Irenæus, 25; 5. Clement of Alexandria, 27; 6. Tertullian, 28; 7. Ammonius, 32; 8. Julius Africanus, 32; 9. Origen, 32; and by all the ancient writers quoted by Eusebius, 34.

Clement of Rome, 15; Ignatius, 19; Polycarp, 20; and the Communities at Lyons and Vienne, 30, may also, perhaps, be reckoned among the number of witnesses.[4]

IV. *The Gospel by Saint John*

Is, with great unanimity and particular respect, considered as the genuine writing of this apostle, by,—1. The ancient writers of the first century, consulted by Eusebius, 21; 2. By Justin Martyr, 24; 3. Tatian, 24, 29; 4. Irenæus, 25; 5. Theophilus of Antioch, 27; 6. Clement of Alexandria, 27; 7. Tertullian, 28; 8. Ammonius, 32; 9. Origen, 32; and by all the fathers cited by Eusebius, 34.

To these might be added the Communities at Lyons and Vienne, 30.[5]

V. *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Romans*

Is declared to be authentic by,—1. Irenæus, 25; 2. Theophilus of Antioch, 27; 3. Clement of Alexandria, 27; 4. Tertullian, 28; 5. Caius, 31; 6. Origen, 32; and by all the ancients noticed by Eusebius, 34.

It would appear that this is also testified by Ignatius, 19; Polycarp, 20; and the Communities at Lyons and Vienne, 30.

VI. *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*

Is considered as genuine by,—1. Clement of Rome, 15; 2. Polycarp, 20; 3. Tatian, 29; 4. Irenæus, 25; 5. Athenagoras, 26; 6. Clement of Alexandria, 27; 7. Tertullian, 28; 8. Caius, 31; 9. Origen, 32; and by all the ancients found in Eusebius, 34.

To the class of probable witnesses belongs Ignatius, 19.

VII. *The Second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*

Has the express testimony of Irenæus, 25; Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian, 28; Caius, 31; Origen, 32; and of all the ecclesiastical fathers to whom Eusebius appeals, 34.

VIII. *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Galatians*

Is declared to be authentic by Irenæus, 25;

---

[1] The figures after the names of the different witnesses enumerated in this chapter, refer to the pages of this work, where their evidences may be found.

[2] Lardner has collected together the evidences of the later witnesses in his Supplement to the first book of the second part of the *Gospel History*, vol. i. pp. 95—102, of the first edition. He has treated of them more copiously in the work which has been so often mentioned, his *Credibility of the Gospel History.* In the Supplement he has generally confined himself to those witnesses who determine also the time when the different books of Holy Writ were composed. The reader will therefore find more witnesses enumerated in my catalogue than in his.

[3] For the later witnesses, see Lardner's Supplement, vol. i. pp. 173—180, of the first edition.

[4] For the later witnesses, see Lard. Sup. i. 218—227, 1st edit.

[5] Ibid. pp. 382—390. The Alogi, a sect that existed in the second century, are said to have rejected it. But we have no information concerning these Alogi that can be depended on; for, properly speaking, we have none else besides the later and uncertain accounts of Philastrius and Epiphanius. And were the case otherwise, still what can the testimony, or rather the bare assertion of anonymous persons avail, when opposed to the unanimous, considerate, and weighty evidences of all the ancients, both learned and unlearned. See Walch's *History of Hereticks*, vol. i. p. 569, seq. of the original; and Professor Schroeckh's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iii. p. 175, seq. of the original.

Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian, 28; Caius, 31; Origen, 32; and by all the ancients found in Eusebius, 34.

IX. *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Ephesians*

Has the testimony of Ignatius, 18; Polycarp, 20; Irenæus, 25; Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian, 28; Caius, 31; Origen, 32; and of all the primitive writers found in Eusebius, 34.

X. *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Philippians*

Has the evidence of Polycarp, 19; Irenæus, 25; Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian, 28; Caius, 31; Origen, 32; and of all the ancients noticed by Eusebius, 34.

And also, as appears probable, of the Communities at Lyons and Vienne, 30.

XI. *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Colossians*

Is attested by Irenæus, 25; Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian, 28; Caius, 31; Origen, 32; and by all the ecclesiastical fathers consulted by Eusebius, 34.

XII. *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians*

Is expressly pronounced by Irenæus, 25; Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian, 28; Caius, 31; Origen, 32; and by all the ancients mentioned by Eusebius, 34.

Probably also by Polycarp, 19.

XIII. *The Second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians*

By Irenæus, 25; Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian, 28; Caius, 31; Origen, 32; and by all the ancients found in Eusebius, 34.

Perhaps by Polycarp, 19.

XIV. *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to Timothy,*

By Irenæus, 25; Theophilus of Antioch, 27; Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian, 28; Caius, 31; Origen, 32; and by all the primitive writers noticed by Eusebius, 34.

And, with some degree of probability, by Polycarp, 20.

XV. *The Second Epistle of Saint Paul to Timothy,*

By Irenæus, 25; Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian, 28; Caius, 31; Origen, 32; and by all the fathers found in Eusebius, 34.

XVI. *The Epistle of Saint Paul to Titus,*

By Irenæus, 25; Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian, 28; Caius, 31; Origen, 32; and by all the ancients mentioned by Eusebius, 34; to be genuine works of this apostle.

XVII. *The Epistle of Saint Paul to Philemon*

Is but rarely mentioned by the ecclesiastical fathers in their writings, on account of its brevity and peculiar contents. Nevertheless, Irenæus, 25; Caius, 31; Origen, 32; and all the ancients cited by Eusebius, 34; have pronounced it authentic.

Which is also testified, apparently, by Tertullian, 28.

XVIII. *The First Epistle of Saint Peter*

Is attested by Papias, 21; Irenæus, 25; Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian, 28; Origen, 32; and by all the ancients found in Eusebius, 34.

To these may be added, perhaps, Polycarp, 20.

XIX. *The Second Epistle of Saint Peter*

Has the evidence of Origen, 32, who nevertheless speaks in some degree doubtfully; and of the greater part of the ancients consulted by Eusebius, 34.[6]

XX. *The First Epistle of Saint John*

Is declared genuine by Papias, 21: Irenæus, 25; Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian, 28; Origen, 32; and by all the ancients found in Eusebius, 34.

XXI. XXII. *The Second and Third Epistles of Saint John.*

Origen, 32, and many of the ancients, 34, doubted of the authenticity of the Second and Third Epistles of Saint John. But the majority of voices, 34, pronounced them genuine works of this apostle.[7]

XXIII. *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Hebrews*

Has the express testimony of Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian, 28; and of all the primitive writers noticed by Eusebius, 34.

To these may be added Clement of Rome, 15; and Justin Martyr, 23.

XXIV. *The Epistle of Saint James*

Is attested by the major part of the ancients whom Eusebius quotes, 34; to which the concordant testimony of the old Syriac Version adds considerable weight.[8]

XXV. *The Epistle of Saint Jude,*

Is asserted to be genuine by Clement of Alexandria, 27; Tertullian 28; Origen, 32; and by the greater part of the ancients noticed by Eusebius, 34.[9]

---

[6] See Lardner's *Supplement*, vol. iii. pp. 215—224, 1st edit. and Michaelis's *Introduction to the N. T.* vol. iv. pp. 346—356, of the learned Mr Marsh's translation.

[7] For the three Epistles of Saint John, see Lardner's *Supplement*, vol. iii. pp. 263—267, 1st edit.; and for the two last, Michaelis's *Introduction to the N. T.* vol. iv. pp. 442—445, of Mr Marsh's translation.

[8] See Michaelis's *Introduction to the N. T.* vol. iv. pp. 308—314, of Mr Marsh's translation; and Lardner's *Supplement*, vol. iii. pp. 85—91, 1st edit.

[9] Compare Lardner's *Supplement*, vol. iii. pp. 327—384, with Michaelis's *Introduction*, vol. iv. pp. 374—395, of Mr Marsh's translation.

CHAPTER V.

OF THE REVELATION OF SAINT JOHN.

The Revelation of Saint John, as it is called, is so much distinguished from all the other writings of the New Testament, both by its contents and style, that we must separate it from them, and investigate its authenticity in a particular inquiry.

SECT. I.—THE CONTENTS OF THE BOOK.

The whole book is entirely occupied with the description of three visions which were shewn to the author. First, there appears to him, whilst in a trance, (*εγενομην εν ϖνευματι,*[1]) One, in human form, surrounded with seven candlesticks, clad in a long robe, and girt with a golden girdle ; his head and hair were white as wool, or as snow, and his eyes like flames of fire ; his feet like molten metal, and his voice like the noise of a rapid torrent ; in his right hand he held seven stars, from his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword, and his countenance shone like the sun in its meridian splendour. This Being dictates to him epistles to the presidents of the seven Christian communities in Asia. These seven epistles contain many forcible exhortations to zeal in virtue or brotherly love, and powerful consolations, especially for the martyrs to this virtue. But they are composed almost entirely from passages of the Old Testament and the Gospels.

Afterwards, (second vision, iv.—xix.) the author falls into another trance ; and sees the Almighty on a majestic throne, holding in his hands a book with seven seals ; and Christ, in the form of a Lamb with seven horns and seven eyes, who is alone capable of taking this book from the hands of God, and of opening its seals, (iv. v.) He opens the first seal, and the Conqueror appears, (vi. 1, 2 :) he opens the second, and War comes on the earth, (vi. 3, 4 :) the third, and Famine displays itself, (vi. 5, 6 :) the fourth is opened, and immediately come forth Death and the Grave, (vi. 7, 8.) After opening the fifth seal, those who had been innocently slain call for revenge, (vi. 9, 10.) When the sixth is opened, frightful appearances are seen, and all things tremble,(vi. 12—17.) But these plagues are only the forerunners of the terrible calamity which succeeds on the opening of the seventh seal. Wherefore, before this circumstance takes place, the servants of God, who are destined to escape this dreadful calamity, are marked by an angel on the forehead ; an hundred and forty-four thousand, twelve thousand from each of the twelve tribes of Israel. The writer now beheld an innumerable multitude out of every nation standing before the throne and the Lamb, in white garments, with palms in their hands, and crying with a loud voice, " Salvation to our God who sitteth on the throne ! and unto the Lamb !" These were come out of great tribulation, and had washed and purified their garments in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore they stand before the throne of God, serve him day and night in his temple, and He who sitteth on the throne covereth them as with a pavilion ; they no more hunger nor thirst ; neither the sun nor any other heat incommodes them ; they are pastured by the Lamb, who conducts them to the fountains of life, and God wipes away all tears from their eyes. After this episode, (vii.) follows the opening of the seventh seal. And, lo !

Seven angels with seven trumpets appear, (viii.—xiv.) The sighs of the saints resound before the throne of God ; immediately these seven angels make themselves ready. The first sounds, and instantly hail and fire, mixed with blood, fall on the earth. The other angels sound successively ; and a great mountain, as it were burning with fire, is cast into the sea. The third part of the sea becomes bitter, and a third part of the creatures therein die. A star, named Wormwood, falls from heaven, (viii. 10, 11 :) the third part of the sun, of the moon, and of the stars is darkened, (viii. 12.) A star falls from heaven, and to him is given the key of the bottomless pit, which he opens, (ix. 1, 2 :) the four angels, which were bound by the river Euphrates, are loosed, (ix. 14 :) a woman clothed with the sun, and having the moon under her feet, is in travail, and is delivered, &c. At last the seventh trumpet sounds ; and now are made various great and terrible preparations, (in the long episode, x.—xiv.) An angel commands Saint John to write down every thing he beheld ; another gives him a book to swallow, &c. A woman in particular appears, clothed with the sun, and having the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars. She is in travail. And, behold ! a great red dragon, with seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads ; whose tail drew away the third part of the stars of heaven, and cast them on the earth. It placed itself before the woman in order to devour her child. But she brought forth a son who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron. The woman then fled into the wilderness. But in heaven commences a war. Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, who is Satan, and his angels. Michael conquers, and the dragon is cast on the earth. Now two frightful beasts arose against the woman, her son, and their followers. The first, extremely hideous, was like a leopard, his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion. The other had two horns as of a lamb; his number was six hundred three score and six, &c. Afterwards the author saw a white cloud, and upon it sat, He, in human form,[2] with a golden crown on his head, and a sharp sickle in his hand, (xiv. 14, and following verses.) There arises a great commotion in heaven. And then appear

---

[1] Chap. i. 10. Comp. chap. iv. 2.

Seven angels with seven vials full of the wrath of God, (xv.—xix.) which are poured out successively; almost in the same manner and with the same effects as happened before, when the seven trumpets were sounded. After all the seven had been poured out, there appeared a woman sitting on a beast; clothed in purple and scarlet, and adorned with gold, precious stones, and pearls; in her hand she held a golden cup full of abominations, and the filthiness of her fornications; and upon her forehead was her name thus written, "Mystery! Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth!" Babylon the Great is destroyed; on which event heaven resounds with songs of praise. And now He, who with his heavenly armies had caused the destruction of Babylon, returns to heaven. This section is almost entirely composed of images and expressions from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel.

Again, (third vision, xx. to the end of the book,) an angel came down from heaven, who had the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain. He laid hold on the dragon, who is Satan, and bound him. Thus bound, he cast him into the bottomless pit, where he was to remain a thousand years; and after that be loosed again for a short time. Thrones appear; and they to whom a power of judgment is committed, seated themselves thereon. The souls of those who had been slain on account of the doctrine of Jesus, revived, and ruled with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead did not live again until the thousand years had expired. This was the first resurrection. After the expiration of the thousand years, Satan will be loosed from his imprisonment, and seduce the nations which are in the four ends of the earth. Then he beheld a white throne, and He sat thereon from whose look earth and heaven fled. The dead, great and small, stand before the throne; books are opened, according to which they are to be judged. One book, in particular, is opened, (xx. 12, and following verses,) the book of life; and whoever was not found written therein was cast into the lake of fire, together with Death and the Grave. Now appeared to him a new heaven, and a new earth. And he beheld the holy city, the new Jerusalem, come down out of heaven from God: its wall was of jasper; the city itself, pure gold; each of its twelve foundations was a precious stone, jasper, sapphire, &c.; each of its twelve gates a pearl;[3] and the streets of gold. But no temple was there; for God and the Lamb are its temple, (xxi. 22, and following verses.) The groundwork of the imagery here also is taken chiefly from Isaiah and Ezekiel; but the poetical dress in which it is clad, the precious stones, pearls, &c. is the author's own production.

The book concludes with this assertion, "I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come Lord Jesus."

SECT. II.—THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BOOK OF REVELATION.

Never did a book exist on whose contents such different opinions have been formed. In the earlier times of Christianity, when its followers were persecuted by the Roman emperors, the Revelation was considered as a prophecy of the speedy destruction of Gentile Rome. Irenæus[1] thought that the number "six hundred threescore and six"[2] indicated ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ. How it was understood after Christianity itself had ascended the imperial throne in the person of Constantine, is unknown. But when the Romish Bishops had erected the horrid system of papal tyranny,[3] and tormented and murdered all that opposed it, Joachim, an abbot in Calabria, during the thirteenth century, pointed the book against the Pope. The Franciscans, on being oppressed by the papal see, followed him. Many of the Protestants eagerly embraced this opinion: and since that time it is become the ruling sentiment among this class of Christians. On the other hand, the Romish church has retaliated, and discovered in it Luther, Calvin, or some one or other of the reformers: nor have there been wanting men, who have fancied that they perceived allusions even to Mahomet. Innumerable are the individual interpretations which have been given in modern times. The afflicted Protestants in Hungary and Bohemia, during the persecutions which were excited against them in the seventeenth century, perceived many prophecies therein which afforded them much consolation. Some imagine it to be a perfect history of the Christian church, from its commencement even to the end of the world. Many learned men, and among these Luther and Calvin, have never attempted an exposition, because they considered it a fruitless labour. Others, lastly, (Wetstein and D'Aubitz in particular) have explained it as indicating the destruction of the Jewish state and divine service. And if any interpretation has the slightest degree of light and probability, it is this.[4]

---

[2] See above, p. 37, 1st col.

[3] ὁ Μαϱγαϱιτης means in the Chaldee not only a "pearl," but likewise a "precious stone;" see Buxtorf, Lex. Talmud, in v. But here it is expressly distinguished from the precious stones, λιθῳ τιμιῳ, chap. xxi. 21, comp. ver. 19, 20.

[1] Advers. Hæres. v. 26, 30.

[2] See beginning of this page.

[3] In the sixth century the bishops of Rome made pretensions to the sovereignty over the whole world, as a right bestowed upon them by God, from being, as they asserted, the successors of Saint Peter, and the vicars of Christ. In the eighth, from the grants of Pepin and Charlemagne, they became temporal lords. In the ninth, they placed themselves on an equality with princes and emperors, and in some cases claimed the superiority. Now it was that they published, if they did not forge, the Decretales and Donatio Constantini Magni. The eleventh century brought this infamous usurpation to its maturity. Hildebrand, a blacksmith's son, who, on being raised to the papal see, took the name of Gregory the Seventh, summoned the emperor Henry the Fourth to appear at Rome under the penalty of ecclesiastical censures; and on his not appearing, pronounced him excommunicated, and released all his subjects from their oath of fidelity. The emperor was at length obliged to comply; but was not received again into the pale of the Church until he had stood barefoot and without nourishment during three days in the castle of Canossa, where the pope then resided, and had humbly prayed for favour. Lastly, since the thirteenth century, they exercised sovereign authority over all the monarchs of the West; pope Innocent the Third deposed the emperor Otto the Fourth, and compelled John, king of England, to make his kingdom tributary to the Romish see. See Mornæi *Mysterium Iniquitatis*; and Cyprian, *History of Popery*.

SECT. III. — REMARKS ON ITS CONTENTS.

1. It stands perfectly insulated in the Bible. Even from the slightest perusal, it will clearly appear, that this book is entirely different from all the other writings not only of the New Testament, but also of the Old. In the other books of the New Testament historical matters and doctrines are delivered in the common language of men. There exists nothing of divine revelations shewn in a trance through figures, except in the passage of the Acts of the Apostles, x. 3—7; and even here the explanation is immediately subjoined, (in the 8th and following verses.) The prophets of the Old Testament, indeed, have delivered their doctrines frequently in visions; their writings often contain those of a similar nature. But entire and mere vision like this, without any subjoined explanation, exists in no book whatever of the Bible, except in the Apocalypse.

2. The author is a person called John; but whether the apostle of that name or not, he does not inform us. The writer calls himself repeatedly John, not only in the preface of the book, (i. 1,) but frequently also in other places, (i. 4, 9; xxii. 8,) where it might have been by no means expected. He professes himself a servant of Jesus Christ, (i. 4,) and a teacher of his religion, (i. 2;) and asserts that he had been on the island of Patmos, on account of the confession of the doctrine of Jesus, (ii. 9,) but whether to preach it there, or banished for having preached it, he does not disclose. And here, in a trance, he saw these visions. But he never suffers even a single word to escape him by which we might be enabled to discover that he was the apostle of the same name. He never, like the evangelist, calls himself "the disciple whom Jesus loved, who leaned on his bosom at supper," (John, xiii.) Not a trace of the apostle's favourite figures and expressions, light, life, &c. is to be found here. On the contrary, the frequent mention of his name is at perfect variance with the custom of the apostle, who never names himself either in his Gospel or Epistles.

3. The book contains many fine passages. Notwithstanding its impenetrable obscurity, we meet with some noble passages, distinguished both for their matter and composition. Besides what has been said above concerning the seven epistles to the Christian communities, we may add, that however ignorant we are to what the destruction in chap. vi. 12—17 alludes, the painting is very sublime. Animated and affecting is the description of the bliss of the heroic workers of virtue, (vii. 9—17;) and majestic is the account of the redemption of the human race through Jesus, (xii. 7—12.)

4. It is inexplicable, at least at present. Of what it treats; whether it be a narration or a prophecy; whether it relate to near circumstances, or remote; whether it consist of one whole, or of many unconnected parts; whether all of it, or nothing, be already fulfilled; what may be the meaning of the mysterious numbers, "a time, and times, and half a time," (xii. 14;) of the significant number, "six hundred three score and six," (xiii. 18;) the thousand years, &c. (xx. 4. and following verses;) of the frightful beasts and monsters;[5] in a word, of the entire con-

---

[4] I will here present the reader with the heads of this interpretation: — 1. Christ takes the book with seven seals from the hand of God, chap. iv. v.; that is, he is commissioned by God to destroy the state and divine worship of the Jews. 2. Seven angels successively sound their trumpets, chap. viii.—xiv.; that is, terrible events precede the destruction. 3. Seven vials filled with the wrath of God are poured out by seven angels, chap. xv.—xix.; that is, that utter destruction is now carried into execution. 4. Christ comes again; the dead are raised, &c. chap. xx.—xxii.; that is, after the coming of Christ to hold judgment on Jerusalem, he will appear again in due time to judge the whole world. In examining this poetical book, we must be governed by the same rules as we adopt when we endeavour to explain the work of any other poet; we must attribute a distinct meaning only to the principal images, and consider all the other separate features of the different images as merely poetical ornament and amplification. Agreeably to this, book, seal, seven seals, trumpets, seven trumpets, &c. have in themselves no particular meaning, but are all nothing more than the poetical dress of the principal images.

[5] See above, p. 37, foot of col. 2.

tents, is most indeterminate and obscure. After the inquiries and assertions of many centuries, we can ascertain of its meaning absolutely nothing. We become confused and disgusted when we dive into expositions so numerous, various, and contradictory. And the Revelation, after all that the learned and unlearned, fanatics, and men of sound understanding, have said and dreamt concerning it, still remains a sealed book. This is the opinion of all, who, from modest distrust of their own penetration, have consulted, I will not say all the interpreters of this book, for that is absolutely impossible, but even a moderate part of them. The late professor Brucker, for instance, says in one of his works, "that he had read a very considerable number of the expositors of this figurative and mystical book, and found incredible contradictions and confusion."

5. Many things in it appear to be erroneous and unchristian. For how shall we harmonize that joy and triumph with which the horrid punishment of their enemies was viewed and published by the saints, with the mild, conciliatory, charitable, and enemy-loving spirit, which exists in the whole New Testament, and particularly in the writings of Saint John, which breathe, as it were, nothing but forgiveness and benevolence? Again, the writer of this book offers at two different times to adore an angel, in the most exact sense of the word, to adore as God. And that not only in the vision, (xix. 9, 10,) but also (xxii. 8, 9) in the usual natural condition of the mind. It is highly improbable that any thing of this kind would be done by a Jew, and yet more improbable by a Christian, but absolutely impossible by an apostle, nay, by him who was the most intimate friend of Jesus! We will pass over the error, as it appears to be, which is met with, (xx. 8,) where the town or kingdom Magog[6] (from Ezekiel, xxxviii. 2) is supposed to be a man; because critics are still in doubt as to the right interpretation of this passage of Ezekiel. Also, in judging of this book, we cannot with propriety say any thing of its numerous grammatical errors, since our present text is extremely defective. And to this subject I will now proceed.

SECT. IV.—OF OUR COMMON TEXT OF THE REVELATION.

Of this book, when compared with the other scriptures of the New Testament, very few manuscripts and ancient versions, and a very small number of extracts in the works of the ancient teachers, are come down to us. About four manuscripts only have any value; the rest are new and worthless. Of these four there are but two complete. Until the time of Wetstein, three manuscripts alone had been collated; and since him, very few, collated with accuracy, have been added to the number. Erasmus, who could make use of one Greek manuscript only, translated the greater part of it from the Vulgate; he even made many alterations purely conjectural. From this edition of Erasmus, our common text of the Revelation of Saint John is for the most part a copy. Destitute therefore of credible manuscripts, versions, and other writings of high antiquity, amidst a multitude of omissions, transpositions, additions, and alterations, we cannot settle the genuine reading. The text of this book is consequently uncertain, even in the best editions.[7]

SECT. V.—THE OPINION OF ANCIENT WRITERS ON THIS BOOK.

The scarcity of critical aid, and, a necessary consequence, the uncertainty of the text, will not astonish us, if we revert to antiquity, and inquire what opinion the ancients had of the Revelation. In the two first centuries this book was rejected by Christian teachers of great respectability. Papias,[1] even if he had not been, as Irenæus has asserted, a disciple of Saint John himself, was certainly a contemporary of this apostle, and indeed bishop of Hierapolis, a town in the vicinity of Ephesus, the place of residence of the apostle, and of the seven Asiatic communities to which the Apocalypse contains epistles. Now this father, whose evidence would be of such great importance in the present inquiry, has not mentioned the Revelation: for Eusebius quotes nothing from him,[2] which he certainly would not have omitted, had he been able, he himself being perfectly in doubt as to its authenticity. Indeed Papias overlooks in his works some other books of the New Testament. But he had not so much reason to notice other books as this, since he was the father of the doctrine of the millennium (the opinion that Christ would reign upon earth a thousand years after the resurrection of the righteous,) which doctrine has always been grounded by all its supporters on the Apocalypse. Eusebius even says,[3] "That Papias was deluded into the opinion of a millennium from an uncertain tradition, and by misunderstanding the apostolical narration," διηγησεις, consequently not apostolic writings. Therefore he either did not know of the Apocalypse, or did not receive it as an apostolical and divine Scripture.[4]

---

[6] Magog, a city, or a kingdom; Gog, the prince of Magog.

[7] See the editions of the New Testament by Wetstein and Griesbach; and Semler's *Theologische Hermeneutik*, iv. 264.

[1] See above, p. 20. [2] Ibid. p. 20. [3] *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39.

[4] This is acknowledged by Dr Storr, a very learned and acute defender of the authenticity and divinity of this book, in his *New*

Caius,[5] an orthodox and very learned presbyter of the Church of Rome, in the second century, asserted even that Cerinthus, in order to establish the coarse doctrine of the millennium, had falsely attributed it to the apostle Saint John. "Caius, in his Disputation, says," (these are the words of Eusebius, Ecc. Hist. iii. 28, for of the writings of Caius none are now extant) "Cerinthus, by the help of revelations which he insinuated to have been written by a great apostle,[6] imposes upon us a variety of wonderful relations which he pretends were shewn to him by angels,[7] and asserts, that after the resurrection, Christ's palace shall be on earth,[8] and that the flesh (men with carnal bodies) shall dwell again at Jerusalem, and indulge in pleasures and sensual appetites. This enemy of the divine Scriptures says also, in order to deceive, (ϑελων ϖλανᾷν) that a thousand years shall be spent in nuptial feasts."[9] The great apostle, by whom the Revelations are pretended to have been written; the wonderful things shewn to him by angels; the palace of Christ on earth, after the resurrection at Jerusalem; the marriage feasts; and the dominion which is to endure for a thousand years, are visibly taken from the Apocalypse. One of the most eloquent defenders of its authenticity confesses himself, that Caius speaks of this book, and not of any other work, as that which Cerinthus had written under the title, αποκαλυψεις.[10] This becomes still more certain, as Dionysius of Alexandria expressly says,[11] that some of the ancients had attributed the book to Cerinthus.

It is this Dionysius who excites in every reflecting and impartial reader the greatest doubt concerning the authenticity of the Apocalypse. He was born at Alexandria, of Gentile parents, his extensive reading led him to Christianity, he became the disciple of Origen, then a presbyter, and lastly, about the year 248, bishop of the Christian community in his native city. His deep penetration and great knowledge of the world, united with the most amiable character, placed him in a condition to do what no one ever has done either before or after him. He held a religious controversy with the followers of Nepos (an Egyptian bishop then lately deceased, who had taught the Millennarian doctrine,) which not only produced no bad consequences, but, on the contrary, convinced his opponents, and inclined them to abandon their error.[12] It is evident from his writings, of which, except two, only fragments preserved in Eusebius are come down to us, and from his life which the same historian relates,[13] that he was a man of distinguished talents, very extensive learning, sound judgment, and what is of the greatest importance, of most excellent character. His amiable modesty and meekness in particular won the hearts of all who knew him intimately; his learning and penetration, united with a fine eloquence, gave him such consequence, that it was customary to choose him umpire in almost all disputes; and by posterity he has been named the great Dionysius. Against the fore-mentioned Nepos (who understood the passages concerning the coming of Christ, especially those in the Apocalypse, literally; and in a particular book which he wrote, "A Confutation of the Allegorists" ελεγχος αλληϱογιϛων, founded on this hypothesis the coarse doctrine of the Millennium,) he composed a work, "Concerning the promises," ϖεϱι επαγγελιων, in two books. In the second, he treats at large of the Apocalypse. The extracts which Eusebius[14] gives from it, are worthy of being introduced here, for they contain not only much important information and sound criticism on the Revelation; but afford us also a good idea of the learning and mode of thinking of its author, and of the care with which the primitive Christians were accustomed to scrutinize the writings which made any pretensions to be apostolical. "Some of the ancients," says Dionysius, "have entirely rejected this book; refuted it section by section; shewing it to be throughout unintelligible and inconsistent. They assert also, that the title is false, since this is neither a work of Saint John, nor even a Revelation, (αποκαλυψις,) because every thing in it is hidden under a coarse and thick veil. They suppose, that not only no apostle, but no pious member of the church, was its author; but ascribe it to Cerinthus, and the sects called after his name, who were desirous of giving credit to his errors, by affixing to them a respectable name. For from him originated the doctrine, that the kingdom of Christ should be temporal, consisting of those things to which he himself, a totally sensual and carnal man, was most addicted; namely, the satiating of the belly, and the gratification of fleshly lusts, by eating, drinking, marrying, by feasts and feast-offer-

---

Apology for the Revelation of Saint John, p. 176 of the original. The testimony of Andrew, bishop of Cæsarea, in the sixth century, of whom we know little or nothing, cannot be produced as a proof in opposition to Eusebius; it is, moreover, obscure. See Dr Storr, p. 175.

[5] See above, p. 31.

[6] Δι' αποκαλυψεων ὡς ὑπο Αποϛολȣ μεγαλȣ γεγϱαμμενων. Dionysius of Alexandria also calls the book αποκαλυψεις, in the plural. Eusebii *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 25, p. 354, edit. Reading.

[7] Τεϱατολογιας ἡμιν, ὡς δι' Αγγελων αυτῳ δεδειγμενας ψευδομενος.

[8] The words in the original are το βασιλειον, and not την βασιλειαν; it must not therefore be rendered, as is done by the Latin translator, regnum Christi. The palace of Christ is the New Jerusalem, chap. xx.

[9] αϱιθμον χιλιονταετιας εν γαμῳ ἑοϱτης γινεσθαι.

[10] See Dr Storr, *New Apology for the Revelation of Saint John*.

[11] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 25.

[12] Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 24.

[13] Ibid. vi. 29, 35, 40, 42—44, 46; vii. 1, 4—11, 20—28.

[14] Ibid. vii. 25.

ings. But I will not venture to reject the book, since many of the brethren highly esteem it;[15] for I believe that its contents surpass my comprehension, are concealed and wonderful. Although I do not understand it, yet I suppose that the words have a certain hidden meaning. I do not measure and judge of it by my own reason, but follow the faith, and consider it above my intellect. I do not reject what I do not comprehend, but admire it the more, because I do not understand it."[16] "After this," continues Eusebius, "he examines the whole work, shews that, according to the common use of language, it is impossible to understand it (αδυνατον αυτην κατα την ϖροχειρον νοεισθαι διανοιαν,) and then adds, — After having ended what is called the prophecy, the prophet pronounces those blessed who keep it, and also himself — 'Blessed is he, who keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book; and I John, who saw and heard these things.' That he therefore was called John, and that this book came from a certain John, I will not deny; I even confess that it was writtenby some holy man, and by divine inspiration, αγιȣ ειναι τινος και θεοπνευϛȣ συνκινω. Nevertheless I cannot easily acknowledge, that this John was the apostle, the son of Zebedee, the brother of James, whose name is affixed to the Gospel and Catholic Epistle. For I conclude[17] from the design and style of the different works, and from what is called the arrangement of the book (εκ της τȣ βιϐλιȣ δ εξαγωγης λεγομενης,) that they were not from one and the same person. For the evangelist never introduces his name, or makes himself known either in the gospel or in the epistle." In the sequel (adds Eusebius) he proceeds in this manner, "Saint John no where speaks of himself, either directly, or as of a third person. On the contrary, the author of the Apocalypse places his name at the very beginning, 'The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John, who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw.' In the epistle at the commencement of this book, he begins, 'John to the seven churches which are in Asia; grace be unto you and peace.' But the evangelist has not prefixed his name to the Catholic epistle; on the contrary, he begins without circumlocution, concerning the mystery of the divine revelation, 'That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes,' &c. And for the like revelation the Lord pronounced Peter blessed; saying, 'Blessed art thou Simon, Son of Jonas, for flesh and blood have not revealed it unto you, but my Father who is in heaven.' Nor in the second or third epistles attributed to him, though indeed they are short epistles, is the name of John prefixed, but only the title of the elder. But this other man (the author of the Apocalypse) was not contented with naming himself once, but repeats it often 'I John,' &c; and at the end he says, 'Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book; and I John, who saw these things and heard them.' Therefore that a person named John was the author of this book ought to be credited. But who he was is uncertain; for he neither says, agreeably to the language of the Gospel, that he is the disciple whom the Lord loved, nor he who leaned on his breast, nor the brother of James, nor he who had himself seen and heard the Lord; whereas he would have introduced some expressions of this kind, if he had intended that we should know who was the writer. But this is not the case. Now many writers called John, I believe, have existed. Also it is probable from the sentiments and words, and their construction, that this man (the author of the Apocalypse) was a different person from him (the apostle.) For the Gospel and Epistle have a certain similarity; they begin in the same manner; the former says, 'In the beginning was the Word;' and the latter, 'That which was from the beginning;' the former says, 'And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, a glory as of the only begotten of the Father;' and the latter the very same, with this trifling variation, 'Which we have heard, which we have seen, and our hands have handled of the Word of life.' Again, we find in both much of life, light, avoiding of darkness, truth, grace, joy, the flesh and the blood of the Lord; judgment, forgiveness of sins, the love of God towards us, the command of love one towards another; the necessity of keeping all the commandments; the judgment of the world, of the devil, of antichrist; the promise of the Holy Ghost; the adoption of God; unlimited faith; the Father and the Son. But the style of the Apocalypse is very different from this, it is dissimilar in almost every point.

---

[15] Dionysius appeals here, 1st, to the testimony of some of the ancients, τινες των ϖρο ἡμων; and 2dly, to that of many of his cotemporaries; "many of them," says he, "highly esteem it" — consequently, not all. It is difficult therefore to say, with Dr Storr, (*New Apology for the Revelation of Saint John*, p. 50, of the original,) that Dionysius only disputes and conjectures, but does not appeal to historical arguments.

[16] The various turns which the author here takes; the indeterminate, obscure assertions which he makes; and the express appeal to the brethren, who highly esteem the Apocalypse; shew, as it appears to me, clearly that in this place he delivers, from tenderness to those of different sentiments, not his whole opinion. "On the contents of the book he neither could nor would decide, since he understood nothing of it:" this, I believe, is the sense of this prolix passage. What immediately follows will hardly permit us to entertain a doubt on the subject.

[17] These internal reasons determine the decision of Dionysius, the former opinions and evidences of antiquity having left him in doubt. The τεκμαιρομαι εκ, κ. τ. λ., do not entirely exclude historical reasons also.

Farther, the Apocalypse neither mentions the Epistle, nor the Epistle the Apocalypse.—The language alse of the Gospel and Epistle is very different from that of the Apocalypse. For the Greek of the former is not only void of grammatical errors, but there is an elegance in the expressions, the argument, and contexture of the discourse; and we do not discover either a barbarism, a solecism, or even an idiomatical expression. As to the other, he who saw the Apocalypse, may perhaps have received wisdom and prophecy; but the language is not good Greek, it is mixed with barbarisms and sometimes with solecisms. These I will not at present quote, as it is not my intention to ridicule, but to shew the dissimilarity of the writings."[18] Here, then, we have most important information concerning the Apocalypse. A scholar of high antiquity, who lived somewhat more than a hundred years after the apostle Saint John, and was then in high estimation for his knowledge and character; who has been in repute with all antiquity, and continues from the very fragments of his writings to obtain the respect of posterity,—this conscientious and learned inquirer was induced to doubt, by the "testimony of some of the ancients," who considered this book not only as not apostolical, but even as worthless and erroneous. Notwithstanding, he would not absolutely reject it, since many of his contemporaries continued to esteem it: on the contrary, he confessed that it was a holy book, and inspired by God. He acknowledged this more from respect to the supporters of the Apocalypse, than from his own conviction; for its contents were to him obscure and incomprehensible. But thus much he asserted with confidence, that it was not written by the apostle Saint John, but by some other person of the same name; for the style and contents of the book prove it incontrovertibly.

The father of Christian ecclesiastical history represents the opinion of antiquity concerning the Apocalypse exactly in a similar manner, but more determinately and clearly.[19] "Of the Revelation," says he, [20] "the majority are even yet" (after all the inquiries that had been then made) "still in doubt;" that is, they reserved to themselves all decisive opinion on it, since they knew not whether they should consider the book as genuine or spurious. "Therefore," says he, [21] "he who chooses, may place the Apocalypse among the ὁμολογȣμένα," (the universally acknowledged.) For at that time the book had many zealous supporters, [22] who asserted its authenticity to be incontrovertible. Eusebius would not deprive those persons of their opinion, but nevertheless reminds them, that it was contradictory to history, for some of the ancients had actually pronounced it spurious, (ετι τε η Ιωαννȣ αποκαλυψις, ει φανειη, ην τινες ως εφην αθετȣσιν, ετεροι δε εγκρινȣσι τοις ὁμολογȣμενοις.)

Such are the evidences against the authenticity of this book, with which its divinity is inseparably connected. [23] On the other side, it is supported by men of equal consequence. Justin Martyr, in the passage quoted above, [24] to prove the doctrine of a millennium, appeals to the Revelation of Saint John the apostle. Irenæus, who lived so near the time of the apostles, and was also the scholar of Polycarp, who had heard Saint John himself, [25] not only proves, [26] the approaching destruction of the Roman monarchy, the wickedness of antichrist, and the doctrine of a millennium, from the Apocalypse, but also expressly asserts, that it was written almost in his (Irenæus's) own time, by Saint John the apostle; and appeals to manuscripts of this book, which were ancient and might be relied on, and which he had seen.[27] Theophilus of Antioch,[28] in one of his works now lost, had refuted erroneous doctrines by authorities from the Revelation of Saint John; consequently, he thought it of divine inspiration. Clement of Alexandria [29] likewise places it among the genuine and divine Scriptures. Tertullian, [30] in proof of its divinity, appeals to the evidence of the communities established by the apostles themselves. And an authority of the greatest weight, Origen, [31] the most learned of all the Christian teachers, who had scrutinized the New Testament on true principles of criticism, and who was an enemy to the doctrine of a millennium, he places the Revelation more than once among the writings of Saint John the apostle, and among the divine books of the New Testament. [32] Jerome, the most learned of the Latin Fathers, is of the same opinion. He states [33] that in his time, the latter part of the fourth century, the Greek church rejected indeed this book, which was received by the Latin; but that he nevertheless esteemed it divine, because he relied rather on the credit of antiquity than on the custom of the times. Now as the Romish church even then (and still more since the sixth century) had begun to be considered the oracle of Christians, from that time therefore until the Reformation, the divinity of the Apocalypse has scarcely ever been farther called in question."[34]

---

[18] This criticism of the language is somewhat overstrained. Neither is that of the Gospel and Epistle so pure, nor that of the Apocalypse so corrupt, as Dionysius has here represented it.

[19] *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 24, 25, and 39.

[20] Ibid. iii. 24, p. 118, Reading.

[21] Ibid. iii. 25, p. 119.

[22] See above, p. 32.

[23] One of the most moderate and impartial opponents of the authenticity of the Revelation of Saint John is Michaelis, in his *Introduction to the New Testament.* See the very learned and very accurate Mr Marsh's trans. vol. iv. p. 461.

[24] See above, p. 23.

[25] Ibid. p. 24.

[26] *Advers. Hæres.* v. 26—end.

[27] We cannot place Melito among the evidences, for we only know that he had written a book on the Revelation of John. (See above, p. 29.) But what the tenor of this book was, whether he held this John to be the apostle, or some indifferent person, or whether he received or rejected the book, we know not.

[28] See above, p. 30.

[29] Ibid. p. 27.

[30] Ibid. p. 28.

[31] Ibid. p. 32.

[32] He appears to assert even, that not a single one of the ancients had doubted its genuineness. See above, p. 33, note [7]. But among the ancients, and especially among the fathers, we must not expect perfect logical precision; consequently, we must not take the expression of Origen in its strict sense. If this were actually his meaning, he was without doubt in an error, as is proved by the information of Dionysius and Eusebius.

[33] *Ep. ad Dardanum.*

SECT. V. — THE TRUE VALUE AND CREDIT OF THE BOOK.

The foregoing observations on its contents and history, lead us to the following decision on the book of Revelation. It is undoubtedly very old; it was known as early as the beginning of the second century after Christ. But, it may be asked, what led so many and creditable men to receive it as an apostolical and divine Scripture? To this it may be answered, that its author was called John; and this, as appears probable, was the cause of its having been placed by these men among the divine Scriptures of the New Testament; they mistook him for the apostle of the same name. Who he was, and where he lived, we know not: but the contents of the book clearly evince that he was a Christian teacher and a pious man. It contains also many passages distinguished both for matter and composition; it has always been, and will always continue to be read by many with real advantage, as an excitement to virtue, and as affording means of consolation. But as we neither understand its contents, nor can depend with certainty on the present text as genuine, the use of it is only so far safe, as its contents agree with the other writings of the New Testament. Whether, lastly, the book was written by the apostle Saint John, or even by any apostle, cannot be positively either asserted or denied.

CHAPTER VI.

CONCLUSIONS DRAWN FROM THE ABOVE MENTIONED TESTIMONIES.

After having heard so many clear and weighty testimonies of antiquity, how is it possible for any intelligent and impartial man to assert, "that the present Scriptures of the New Testament were not declared to be genuine and divine before the Council of Laodicea, which was held about the year 364?" The enemies of Christianity — for these only make the assertion — would consequently wish to insinuate to the world, that before the fourth century Christians were entirely divided in their opinions, concerning the genuine Scriptures of the apostles and evangelists, and that at one time more, at another, fewer, books were received under this title, until at length the decisive sentence of the Council of Laodicea established the present canon. The author of the *Dictionnaire Philosophique Portatif* has lately brought this story again into notice. But if our adversaries would cast only a slight glance over the writings of the above mentioned teachers of the first two centuries and a half, they would undoubtedly blush at their own ignorance and boldness. Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, prove their tenets by authorities taken from these Scriptures; and indeed from these only, rejecting all others as either forged, or merely human compositions. Many teachers of the first and second centuries mention a collection of the evangelical and apostolical writings as already existing.. All the ancient writers whom Eusebius has cited, pronounce either unanimously or with a great majority of voices, these writings, and only these, to have been genuine works of the evangelists and apostles. Notwithstanding these circumstances, it is pretended that the first centuries were quite undecided and uncertain on this subject! Notwithstanding these circumstances, it is asserted, that the Council of Laodicea first established our present canon![1]

All the Scriptures of our New Testament, it is confessed, have not been received with universal consent as genuine works of the evangelists and apostles.[2] But that man must have predetermined to oppose the most palpable truths, and must reject all history, who will not confess, that the greater part of the New Testament has been universally received as authentic, and that the remaining books have been acknowledged as such by the majority of the ancients; and, therefore, that all our present books of the New Testament (the Apocalypse perhaps excepted) have stronger proofs for their authenticity, than can be produced for any of the other writings of antiquity, for those of Xenophon, Polybius, Tacitus, or Cicero, which, nevertheless, are received as genuine with such confidence, that the whole world pronounced Hardouin insane, when he attempted to call their authenticity in question. For, in the present case, we have not merely a single solitary witness or two, but a great variety. They name these scriptures not simply in a casual way, but relate their history, and make long extracts from them. These witnesses are men, who were intimately acquainted either with the evangelists and apostles themselves, or their immediate disciples; and lived, at farthest, not later than about two generations after their times. They were very well versed in every kind of profane literature; they were philosophers and scholars, who had formed their taste, and sharpened their judgment by the study of the best writers of antiquity, of Homer, Euripides, Æschylus, Plato, and Aristotle; they were scholars, who had read with attention all the works of the Christian authors; who were also familiar with the apocryphal writings, (of which, in the first century, existed but few,[3]) and after accurate scrutiny, rejected them. They also doubted of the truth of some of the books of our New Testament, and thereby established an evident proof that they were by no means credulous. Some of them travelled in person purposely to examine into the truth of the books, which made pretensions to divine inspiration, received accurate information on this point from the communities planted by the apostles themselves, and in their controversies with the heretics appealed to them with confidence.[4]

---

[34] See Lardner's *Supplement*, vol. iii. pp. 356—364, of the first edition. As well in respect of learning, as also of impartiality, the late Chancellor Reuss of Tubingen, and his son-in-law, Dr Storr, are among the most considerable defenders of the Apocalypse, — the former, in his *Defence of the Revelation of Saint John, in Answer to the Objections of Dr Semler*, 1772, 8vo.; and the latter, in the *New Apology for the Revelation of Saint John*, Tubingen, 1783, in 8vo. The history of the modern controversies on this subject may be seen in Walch's *Latest History of Religion*, Part vii. p. 257, and following pages of the original.

[1] This canon of the council is moreover spurious. See Prof. Spittler on this subject.

[2] See above, p. 34.

BOOK III.

THE UNCORRUPTED PRESERVATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER I.

THE BOOKS EXTANT AT PRESENT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, ARE THE SAME WRITINGS WHICH WERE ORIGINALLY COMPOSED BY THE AUTHORS WHOSE NAMES THEY BEAR.

But, it may perhaps be said, have not those books been long ago destroyed? Are not these which we have at present in the New Testament some of the writings which, in the early ages of Christianity, were falsely ascribed to the immediate disciples of Jesus? Or, how can we be assured, whether they are not so changed by latter interpolations and erasures, as to have become entirely different from the originals? It is therefore necessary to shew, that these writings have descended to us unaltered, or, in other words, the uncorrupted preservation of our present New Testament. And this I shall prove,

I. *From their Contents.*

As early as the two first centuries of the Christian era, we find the very same facts, and the very same doctrines, universally received by the Christians, which we, of the present day, believe on the credit of the New Testament. That Jesus was born under the Roman Emperor Augustus, and taught in the Jewish territory; that he publicly performed many and great miracles; was persecuted by his enemies the Jews, though innocent, even to death on the cross; and arose alive from the grave on the third day after his death; that a belief in this Jesus and his doctrine is the only way to salvation for all those to whom they have been promulgated; that this same Jesus has published and ordained for his disciples the wisest and most salutary precepts in respect of our conduct towards God, towards ourselves, and towards our neighbour; that hereafter he will descend gloriously from heaven, into which he visibly ascended, in order to awaken the dead, and to judge the whole race of mankind: all this is asserted in all the earliest writings of Christian antiquity[1] to have been the universal belief of Christians.[2] And all this likewise is contained in those books which we now possess under the names of the Evangelists and Apostles.

---

[3] Even here the enemies of Christianity betray themselves. They confound all together, and mistake writings forged in much later times for works which were in circulation soon after the times of the apostles under their names. Out of a single book, with different titles, they make many books. And through these effects of ignorance or dishonesty, the number of apocryphal works is magnified in such an amazing degree, that John Tolland, in his *Amyntor*, has filled many pages only with the bare names of them. This error has been most amply refuted by Mr Jeremiah Jones, in his *New and Full Method of Settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament*, London, 1726, 3 vols. 8vo., in which he goes through each of these apocryphal works separately, and proves that the ancients rejected them as spurious, and pronounced the Scriptures of our New Testament exclusively to be the genuine works of the evangelists and apostles. And this is also testified by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* lib. iii. cap. 25) from his own knowledge of the earliest writings. The major part of these apocryphal works were written in the fourth century. They all agree in essential matters with our New Testament, but they contain also a variety of fables. See these writings in Jo. Alb. Fabricii *Cod. Apocr. N. T.* vol. iii. in 8vo.; Comp. Beausobre *Hist. du Manichée*, vol. ii.; and Lardner's *Credibility of the G. H.* part ii. vol. xii. pp. 157—174, first edition.

[4] Lardner deserves the greatest credit for his labours on the proof of the authenticity of the New Testament. In the second part of his *Credibility of the Gospel History*, (which was originally published in 12 vols. 8vo.) and in the *Supplement*, (in 3 vols.) he has collected the evidences of the Christian authors in a chronological order according to the centuries.

[1] See above, part I. book ii. chap. 1—3.

[2] It is only necessary to read, for instance, the 19th and 20th chapters of Irenæus's fifth book, *Adversus Hæreses*, where he gives a short sketch of the Christian doctrine as it then existed. The principal writings on this subject are, Dionysii *Petravii Dogmata Theologica*; Jacob Basnage *Histoire de l'Elise*; Lardner *L. cit.*; and Dr Semler's *Collections from the Writings of*

II. *Because an universal corruption of these writings was impossible; nor can the least vestige of such a corruption be found in history.*

That these books should be universally corrupted was totally impossible, from the very state of Christianity. The Christian religion, even in the first century, was spread through every part of the known world. From the persecutions which then took place, the distinct communities existing at Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, and in many other considerable cities, had little or no external connection with each other. As early as the first century arose heretics, whose tenets were refuted by the orthodox in their writings. Christians, even of no rank or consequence, were in possession of many copies of these books, which were reverenced and read with the greatest attention.[3] During the two first centuries no secret was made of any one relation or doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. On the contrary, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Irenæus, appeal to the facility which every one enjoyed of reading their Scriptures; and what has been termed the *disciplina arcani*, which attempted an occasional suppression of different histories or doctrines, is a custom of later times, and crept into Christianity with Pseudo-Platonism.[4] And at a very early period many translations of them were made into the Syriac and Latin languages. Now it must have been almost a miracle, if, notwithstanding the great variety of copies and translations of the originals spread abroad among distinct communities existing in no external connection with each other; notwithstanding these writings were held in profound reverence, and diligently studied; notwithstanding the opposite vigilance of heretics and orthodox; if, I say, the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists have been falsified in all the copies of the originals, and of the various translations, without the opposition of any one community, or of any single teacher.

In the beginning, it is true, the orthodox and heretics reciprocally accused each other of having falsified the Holy Scriptures. But even these very accusations evince the great attention with which the Christians watched over the purity of their sacred books, and the absolute impossibility of their universal corruption. An unknown author, noticed by Eusebius,[5] accuses the followers of Artemon with having introduced their heterodox system into the Divine Scriptures. In support of his assertion, he appeals to their own copies, and asserts, that they were not only different from the copies of the orthodox, but also perfectly at variance with each other; and reproaches them with being unable to support these alterations by the authority of any ancient manuscripts. It is by no means certain, that these heretics had really introduced those suppositious alterations into their copies of the New Testament; since the accuser seems to mean nothing more than the Greek translation of the Old Testament, which is called the Septuagint; produces no proofs of any such corruptions; and, in short, speaks in a tone too declamatory, to be received on this subject as an accurate relater.[6] But should we grant, that the accusations against Artemon and his followers were justly preferred, yet even these prove, that in the earliest ages of Christianity it was impossible for any one to attempt a corruption of the evangelical and apostolical writings, without meeting public opposition, and without being openly branded for a deceiver. That we may perceive how much such an alteration of the Sacred Scriptures was abhorred, I will quote the same author's sentiments on the subject. "What a daring crime this is, (that is, the corruption of the sacred books,) possibly they themselves (the followers of Artemon) are not ignorant; for they must either not believe the divine Scriptures to have been inspired by the Holy Ghost, or else they must imagine themselves wiser than the Holy Ghost: on the first supposition they are infidels; on the second they are out of their senses." The heretics retaliated, and accused the orthodox of a similar offence. The Manicheans pretended, that the books of the New Testament were not written by the evangelists and apostles, but were falsely attributed to them in later times, or were at least violently mutilated and corrupted by the Christians.[7] But the Manicheans adopted this pretence, because the Scriptures of the New Testament are evidently contradictory to their erroneous tenets concerning the Old Testament, the human nature of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and two eternal principles.[8] They have themselves refuted their own assertion, by quoting as genuine those passages of the New Testament which treat of the discourses and miracles of Jesus, without any other proof than those by which we prove the

---

the old teachers, which he has prefixed to Baumgarten's *Dogmatic and Polemic.*

[3] See Walch *On the Use of the Holy Scripture among the ancient Christians.* Leipzig, 1779, in 8vo.

[4] See above, p. 22.

[5] *Hist. Eccles.* lib. v. cap. 28, pp. 253—255.

[6] See Lardner's *Credibility*, vol. iii. pp. 43—48, 1st edit.

[7] Faustus, one of the most learned among the Manicheans, had brought forward this accusation with the greatest show of probability, in the work which was refuted by Augustine; lib. xxxii. cap. 2, lib. xxxiii. cap. 3, in Augustini Opera, vol. viii. p. 320, et pp. 329, 330, edit. Benedictin.

[8] See the passages from Faustus quoted above.

authenticity of the whole.[9] Nor have they offered any historical argument as a proof of their assertion. "There are absurdities in the writings of the New Testament. The evangelists contradict themselves. The author of the gospel attributed to Saint Matthew, speaks of Matthew in the third person."[10] This was the whole proof which the learned Faustus could advance in support of his supposition. Arguments, which in part are visibly false; and which, even if they were true, could determine nothing in an historical discussion, where every thing depends on the attestation of credible witnesses. In order to have established his assertion, Faustus ought to have demonstrated, that all the old writers and manuscripts which we produce as evidences for the authenticity of the New Testament, prove nothing. He ought to have quoted opposite evidences and manuscripts, different from those which existed among the Christians. He ought to have shewn from history, when and where these corruptions were made. Had the doctrines of Christianity been really uncertain, this learned writer, who lived in the latter part of the fourth century, might without much trouble have produced these proofs. But on all these subjects he is perfectly silent; and every thing which he is able to produce, consists entirely in self-formed conclusions and charges, which are as groundless as the principal accusation. His adversary, Augustine, challenges him to produce this proof, and appeals with perfect confidence to the unanimous testimony of all the teachers, and manuscripts of antiquity. "What writings," says he,[11] "can you receive as genuine, if you reject those of the evangelists and apostles? We are convinced of the genuineness of the apostolical writings in the same manner, as we know that the works of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, or Varro, were derived from those whose names they bear. Who can be so absurd as to reject our Scriptures, for whose genuineness, from the time of the apostles, the Church has deposed such numerous and concordant testimonies?" This very accusation, therefore, of itself, proves that the arguments for the authenticity of the evangelical and apostolical writings are incontrovertible.

III.—*From the Agreement of all the Manuscripts.*

The manuscripts of the Scriptures of the New Testament, which are still extant, are far more numerous than those of any other book in the world. Above two hundred and fifty have been already collated by critics in their different editions. Of these, it is true, all do not contain the whole of the New Testament: the greater part have only the Gospels; others contain also the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles; and a very small number the Revelation of Saint John.[1] All these manuscripts, which were written in very different parts of the world, and of which some are above twelve hundred years old, give us the books of the New Testament in all essential matters perfectly accordant with each other, as any one may easily convince himself by examining the editions published by Mill, Küster, Bengel, Wetstein, or Griesbach. The thirty thousand various readings, which are said to be found even in the manuscripts collated by Mill, consist almost entirely in nothing but palpable errors in transcription, or trifling grammatical and verbal differences, which by no means make any alteration in the sense of the subject.[2] Some, indeed, change the sense, yet only in passages which relate unimportant historical and geographical circumstances, or other collateral matters.[3] And the few which make any alteration in things of consequence, do not on that account place us in absolute uncertainty. For either we can discover the true reading by collating the other manuscripts, versions, and quotations found in the works of the ancients;[4] or, should this not be the case, yet we can even then explain with certainty the doctrine from other passages of the sacred books.[5] These numerous variations, therefore, are the most convincing proof, that the Holy Scriptures have not been altered in any point of doctrine or morality, or other matter of importance; because they are found perfectly concordant in all manuscripts of the originals and of the versions, which have been written and composed in Europe, Asia, and Africa. So far, therefore, from being hostile to the uncorrupted preservation of the books of our New Testament, (as some enemies of Christianity have asserted from ignorance or wicked motives, and as many Christians have likewise apprehended from groundless fear,) these variations afford us, on the contrary, an additional and most convincing proof, that they exist at present, in all essential matters, as they left the hands of their authors.

---

[9] Loc. cit.

[10] Loc. cit.

[11] Contra Faustum, lib. xxxiii. cap. 6, pp. 330, 331, edit. Benedictin.

[1] Besides these, a great number are preserved in the libraries of Germany, Italy, and other countries, which have not yet been consulted. The most perfect and accurate information concerning the MSS. which have been used in editions of the Greek Test. is to be found in the Prologomena to Mill's and Küster's edition of the N. T. in the Prologomena to Wetstein's N. T. and in Michaelis' *Intr. to the N. T.* vol. iii. pp. 185—361, of the learned and accurate Mr Marsh's translation.

[2] As, Mark, iv. 32, instead of *ὁταν σπαρη*, "when it is sown," *ὁταν φυη*, "when it is grown up;" chap. v. 9, *απεκριθη λεγων*, "he answered, saying," *λεγει αυτῳ*, "he says unto him;" or instead of *εισελθοντες*, *ελθοντες*; instead of *ἑλληνιστας*, *ἑλληνας*; instead of *προετεινεν*, *προετινεν*; instead of *φαρισαιου*, *φαρισαιων*; instead of *εβαπτισα*, *εβαπτισθη*.

[3] For instance, *γαδαρηνων* for *γεργεσηνων*; *βηθαβαρα* for *βηθανια*; or, Luke, xxiv. 23, the addition, *εφαγε, και τα επιλοιπα εδωκεν αυτοις*; Acts of the Apostles, viii. 39, *πνευμα ἁγιον επεσεν επι τον ευνȣχον*.

[4] As 1 Tim. iii. 16, where we find the different readings, *Θεος ὁς*, and *ὁ*.

[5] For instance, Acts of the Apostles, xx. 28, some MSS. instead of *Θεȣ* have *Κυριȣ*. Let us suppose that we could not here make out which is the true reading, yet the matter may be determined from many other passages.

IV.—*From the agreement of the old versions and quotations found in the ecclesiastical fathers.*

After all, should any one entertain a doubt concerning the uncorrupted preservation of our books of the New Testament, it must perfectly vanish, if we consider the wonderful agreement of all the old versions, and of all the quotations and extracts found in the ecclesiastical fathers. There is still extant a Syriac translation of all the books of the New Testament, (the Second Epistle of Saint Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of Saint John, the Epistle of Saint Jude, and the Revelation of Saint John, alone excepted,) which in all probability, was made in the first century. In the same period existed in the Western Church Latin versions, of which considerable fragments still remain. The Latin translation of Jerome, (which is generally called the Vulgate,) the Coptic, different Arabic, the Ethiopic, Armenian, Persic, and Gothic versions, are indeed in part much more modern, and therefore not considered by critics on the New Testament as of equal consequence.[1] Yet they prove thus much, that in all communities of Christians, both in the East and West, the same writings have ever been regarded as genuine works of the evangelists and apostles, which we in the present day find still unaltered in our New Testament. If we add to these circumstances, that the ecclesiastical fathers of the first centuries have quoted almost every verse of the New Testament, and, in regard to essential points, exactly agreeably to our present text: also, that many of them (for instance, Origen, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustin, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, and Œcumenius,) have left us commentaries either on all, or on individual books of the New Testament, of which the scriptural text exactly coincides with our printed copies,—we must without hesitation confess, that the books which are now extant in our editions of the New Testament are the uncorrupted writings of the evangelists and apostles.

The enemies of Christianity, notwithstanding, continually pretend that they have been corrupted! No one, indeed, who possesses the least knowledge of the principles of criticism, will readily assert, that the various readings are corruptions. But on this subject we meet with Collins, who appeals to an alteration of the Gospels, which, according to the information of the ecclesiastical history, is said to have taken place in the sixth century under the Emperor Anastasius. Victor, bishop of Tunis in Africa, relates in his *Chronicon*,[2] that the Emperor Anastasius, considering that the Gospels were written by illiterate men, ordered them to be improved at Constantinople. This Victor is the only evidence that can be brought forward for this event; for Isidore of Seville relates it merely on his authority. He lived in Africa; consequently far distant from the scene where the alteration is said to have taken place. All the other writers make not the least mention of this circumstance: which, without doubt, would have excited bitter and unanimous complaints against the Emperor, already an object of general hatred. Moreover, Victor offers not the shadow of a proof in support of his narration: he names no immediate witnesses on whose authority he relates the story. Now, from a relation so very incredible, Collins, in opposition to the unanimous assertions of so many and such credible witnesses, attempts to prove the corruption of the New Testament.[3] But, even if we should grant that this information, delivered by an African bishop, of an event which is said to have happened at Constantinople, is deserving of credit; yet the alteration would not have taken place in all the manuscripts which existed in the Eastern Church; for, according to his own information, it is said to have been made only in the manuscripts at Constantinople. And if it had been actually put in execution in all the Oriental manuscripts, yet the manuscripts of the Western Church, over which Anastasius had no authority, would have remained unaltered. Farther, if we should grant even this, yet it was impossible to alter all the manuscripts of all the versions. Had, therefore, such an alteration been actually undertaken, it could not have been universal; but there would still have remained either the manuscripts of the West, or at least the versions, from which we might have been enabled to restore the original text. Since, therefore, not only all the Oriental, and all the Western, manuscripts of the Greek Gospels perfectly coincide with each other; but also all the old translations, and all the citations and commentaries of the primitive ecclesiastical writers are in perfect harmony with them,—it is most evident, either that the relation of Victor is a mere fable, or that such an alteration, should it even have been resolved on, was never actually put into execution.[4]

---

[1] Michaelis has given very ample information concerning these versions in his *Intr. to the N. T.*

[2] Ad. A. 506. See Scaligeri Thesaurus temporum.

[3] In his "*Discourse of Free-thinking,*" pp. 69—73. In order to prove that the Scriptures of the New Testament are perfectly uncertain, he introduces the following arguments:—1. Because the Canon of the New Testament was not made until sixty years after the death of Christ. (But it could not have been formed earlier, for before that time all the Holy Scriptures had not been composed.) 2. From the thirty thousand different readings in Mill. And, 3. From the passage of Victor alluded to above.

Had the enemies of Christianity studied the proofs of our holy religion with more diligence and impartial care, they would not, at least, have considered such palpable absurdities as objections to its truth. The objection of Collins has perhaps a semblance of reason. But when Chubb says,[5] "It is abundantly evident that the Bible has been corrupted in the dark ages of Popery by the clergy, in whose hands it at that time exclusively existed;" it is, in fact, to assert, that the Pope and his clergy had brought together all the manuscripts of the New Testament, and the almost innumerable manuscripts of the different versions, and all the works of the ecclesiastical fathers; and when, with wonderful sagacity, they had projected and carried into execution such an almost miraculous undertaking, that with inconceivable stupidity they altered not a single one of those passages which evidently contradict their erroneous tenets; for instance, concerning papal supremacy, the worship of saints, the mass, celibacy, monastic vows, purgatory, and indulgences.

PART II.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK I.

THE AUTHORS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT POSSESS IN A VERY HIGH DEGREE ALL THE REQUISITE QUALITIES OF CREDIBLE EVIDENCES.

If we now unite the propositions already proved; if we consider the great number of credible witnesses, who unanimously relate, that soon after the death of Jesus, four Gospels, and the same number of Epistles as still exist in the collection of the New Testament, were written by the apostles and disciples of Jesus; that these books, as we possess them at present, are the very same in all the translations and manuscripts of the original; and perfectly coincide with the quotations and commentaries of the primitive writers,—we must either reject the writings of Xenophon, Thucydides, Livy, and Tacitus, for whose authenticity neither so many nor strong arguments can be found, and, in a word, all the ancient writings in the world, as not genuine,—or we must acknowledge, that the Scriptures of the New Testament are authentic, and in every matter of importance perfectly uncorrupted.

But from this alone we cannot determine their credibility. An author may write of events which happened in his time, and in the place of his residence, but should he be either credulous or a fanatic, or should we have reason to suspect his honesty, his evidence is of no value. In order, therefore, to establish the credibility of an author, we must examine more closely into his particular character, and inquire whether he possessed abilities sufficient to scrutinize the truth, and honesty enough faithfully to relate it as it happened.

Now the historical writers of the New Testament are distinguished also from all others whose credibility has never been called in question by any reasonable man, in this respect, that if historical subjects were capable of mathematical demonstration, we must acknowledge that their credibility has been not only morally proved, but even demonstrated mathematically.

SECT. I.—THEY WERE IMMEDIATE WITNESSES.

The writers of the New Testament lived at the time and in the place of the actual occurrence of the events which are the subject of their history. Saint Matthew, Saint John, Saint Peter, Saint James, and Saint Jude, were Jews by birth, and lived in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, at Jerusalem, the scene of the history which they relate. They were all, moreover, immediate disciples of Jesus, and the facts contained in their histories had been subject to the scrutiny of their own senses. It is true that Saint Paul was a native of Tarsus, and not among those who had been the friends of Jesus, and the eyewitnesses of his actions. Yet he had lived a long time at Jerusalem, had studied theology under Gamaliel, a Jewish scholar, at that time in the greatest repute, and diligently employed himself in acquiring a thorough knowledge of the Jewish religion. We have but few biographical memoirs extant of Saint Mark and Saint Luke: yet thus much do we know, that the former composed his history under the immediate inspection of Saint Peter,[1] and the latter his narration under the immediate inspection of Saint Paul.[2] Their histories must therefore be considered to possess the same authority as if they had been written by the eye-witnesses themselves, whom we have named above.[3]

---

[4] See *Remarks upon a late Discourse of Free-thinking*, by Philoleutherus Lipsiensis, Cambridge, the sixth edition, 1725, in 8vo. Dr Richard Bentley, the author of this work, defends the authenticity of our New Testament, particularly against the objections which are drawn from the Various Readings, and from the above mentioned information of Victor, pp. 61—84. In all probability this story of Victor took its origin from his having misunderstood the account concerning Macedonius, patriarch of Constantinople. See loc. cit. p. 82.

[5] In his Posthumous Works, vol. i. pp. 65, 66, 118, 121, 122, &c.

[1] See the testimonies of Clement of Alexandria, Papias, and Tertullian, on this subject.

SECT. II. — THEY WERE ALSO COMPETENT WITNESSES.

The writers of the New Testament had the most important reasons, and sufficient abilities, to examine into the truth or falsehood of their histories. They relate their memoirs, not for the purpose of delighting future ages, or of conveying information in the usual method of historical writings; but they build on them a system of religion, from which alone they expected their temporal and eternal welfare. "If Christ be not risen," says Saint Paul, (1 Cor. xv. 13—19,) "then is our doctrine and your faith false; then are we yet in our sins; then they who have died in the belief of the truth of our religion are perished for ever; then are we persecuted Christians of all men the most miserable." A history which they conceived to be so essential, the very foundation of all their hopes, and of all their faith, had been undoubtedly scrutinized, and proved by them with the most anxious care.

SECT. III.—THEY WERE BY NO MEANS CREDULOUS.

"But who," it is objected, "is unacquainted with the power of credulity and fanaticism? The innumerable multitude of fanatics of whom history gives us information, may have employed care and labour enough on the examination of their wonderful adventures; yet credulity and fanaticism had blinded their reason to that degree, that some of them have even fancied that they had a daily intercourse with the Deity, and were furnished with miraculous powers. No one, for instance, can deny, that Baron Swedenborg was a man of learning, penetration, and honesty; nevertheless this man, in other respects of sound judgment and worthy of credit, believed and asserted, for the space of more than forty years, that he had frequent visits from angels, was caught up into heaven, and there received a variety of new doctrines." Certainly this observation ought to render us extremely cautious in examining such histories, particularly those connected with a religious system. But this caution and severity of examination, when applied to the history of the New Testament, shew us so much the more evidently, that the writers of it possessed the most perfect capability of avoiding any errors, and of accurately examining the true ground of their narratives. The events which they relate are of such a nature, that the proof of their truth requires nothing more than sound organs of sense. The examples of the astonishing deceptions of fanatical people relate for the most part to opinions, seldom or never to historical subjects, or to matters of fact. And who does not perceive that these are widely different from each other? In a court of justice we can prove the truth of a fact by means of witnesses; but it has never been heard, that the truth of an opinion (for instance, the immateriality or immortality of the soul) was established by the deposition of evidences. A man may likewise be deceived from certain affections incomparably easier in the case of opinions, than in the case of facts. In the case of facts also there exists a great difference. The quaker, Jacob Maylor, in the time of Cromwell's protectorate, could easily imagine that he was transformed into the person of Christ, and made the Saviour of the world; or another fanatic may with equal ease persuade himself, that he enjoys visions of the Deity, and that he feels a particular inspiration of the Spirit. For, in order to ascertain the truth of facts which concern ourselves, and our internal sensations, we must presuppose the person endowed with a sound and well-cultivated judgment, and no common knowledge of the distinction between sensations and imaginations. But that a man, Jesus, taught at Jerusalem in the reign of Tiberius; that he revealed certain new and peculiar doctrines to his disciples; that in public places, and in the presence of many persons, he healed a variety of people who were lame, blind, and dumb, and also, under circumstances of the like publicity, gave life to the dead; that he died on the cross, was buried in the customary manner of the Jews, and on the third day came again alive to his friends; had intimate intercourse with them as before his death; and in the sight of many of these friends ascended gradually into the air, and at last vanished from their eyes,—such facts require, in order to prove their truth, and set them beyond the possibility of doubt, nothing more than that the witness's organs of sight and hearing be sound, and that he uses them like one awake.

To this must be added, that the apostles were by no means credulous. They might perhaps have possessed this passion, so prevalent among the Jews, in other respects, and have amused themselves with fables. But, in this matter, they were certainly so far removed from it, that we have reason to think them rather incredulous and obstinate. Their Master had informed them beforehand, that after his passion and death he would arise from the dead: but scarcely had the Roman guard taken him into custody, before they all fled, resigned their flattering hopes, and absolutely denied that they had ever known him. Some women relate that they had found the grave empty, and had spoken with Jesus alive. Now, had the apostles been in the least degree credulous, they would not assuredly have had the least hesitation in believing it: but they ridiculed it as an idle tale. (Luke, xxiv. 1—11.) Saint Peter, nevertheless, instigated by curiosity, runs to the place, and finds the report perfectly true; the grave is open and empty; he wonders and departs. (Luke, xxiv. 12.) After some time Jesus comes into their assembly, where ten of the apostles are present: and now they can doubt no longer. But Saint Thomas, who was absent, thinks them all deceived, and will not believe before he has accurately inspected the body of this person, and discovered on it the marks of his crucifixion, and the wound in his side. (John, xx. 24, 25.) And how violently was Saint Paul prepossessed against the truth of this history? How active in discovering those who confessed it, and in procuring their death? (Acts, viii. ix.) Can we believe that such people were credulous, and suppose that they received their history as true on the first vague report without farther examination? Had Cromwell, in the presence of the Lords and Commons, asserted that he had seen the unfortunate King Charles a few weeks after his execution, first in Westminster Abbey, and afterwards many times in Saint James's Palace, and conversed with him frequently for several hours together; had the usurper, in consequence of this resigned the protectorate, and made preparations for bringing back the exiled Queen and family; we should have conceived, perhaps, that he had experienced an extraordinarily violent fit of fanaticism; but it would have occurred to no one to accuse him on this account of credulity; and to assert, that he had blindly received this relation as true only on the information of an old soldier, or a woman that was perfectly unknown to him.

---

[2] See the testimonies of Tertullian and Origen.

[3] The Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel by Saint Luke form but one book; for in the Acts of the Apostles, i. 1, the writer names his gospel "ϖϱωτον λογον, — librum primum, — the first part;" he continues immediately from thence, where he had left off in the gospel; and has dedicated both to one man, namely, Theophilus. Consequently, whatever is said by the ancients concerning the History of Saint Luke, is to be understood not only of the Gospel, but also of the Acts of the Apostles.

SECT. IV.—NEITHER WERE THEY FANATICS.

Some may perhaps be inclined to adduce the above example against the truth of the Gospel history. The strangeness and wonderfulness of such a relation, it may be said, would have inclined every reasonable man to have conceived that the Protector was rather a fanatic than that his narration was true. This I shall hereafter examine. And here, where we are not treating of the miracles, but merely of the common and customary events, of the apostolical history, we must first examine this question, Whether the writers of the New Testament can reasonably be considered as fanatics; or whether we cannot discover evident traces, that they were not in the least infected with this dangerous poison of the human understanding? An inquiry which will conduct us into one of the most interesting and instructive parts of the history of the human understanding; and is absolutely essential for the conviction of Christians, on account of the frequent accusation of fanaticism which is made by the enemies of the New Testament. To examine this subject, therefore, more accurately, will amply repay our trouble.

I will, in the first place, endeavour to collect from history the different features in the character of this astonishing phenomenon, a fanatic; and then compare the picture with our scriptural writers.[1] A fanatic thinks himself always the chief favourite of Heaven. And truly a person in whom the Divinity immediately dwells, with whom he deigns daily to hold immediate converse, and makes a living oracle; such a person most assuredly has reason to believe, that he is extraordinarily favoured by God. This fanatical pride is often carried to such an extent in men, that they convince themselves God should do every thing which they desire; and if he does it not, think themselves offended, break out into acrimonious complaints against him, or uncharitable accusations of ungodliness in other men, which they fancy to be the cause of the disaffection of Heaven. Disorder and contradiction in their system, (if a collection of unconnected, problematical, and contradictory opinions can be called a system,) and obscurity and absurdity in their explication of it, form another feature in the fanatical character. Men, in whom the power of the senses is extended to a kind of madness, are not in a condition to employ the reasoning faculties of the understanding, which require internal tranquillity. And the constant tumult of their minds renders them incapable of speaking connectedly and rationally. Should they discourse of their inspiration, that obscurity becomes perfect nonsense. A fanatic may be a person of great talents and rare prudence in the management of his temporal concerns. But this strength of mind is of no other use to him only to sink him deeper in the vortex of his fancies and follies. And this absurdity in his discourses, compared with the prudence in the management of his temporal concerns, forms one of the strongest contrasts that we can imagine. Fanatics are generally enemies, or at least contemners, of all written revelation, because it renders their own continual inspiration perfectly unnecessary. They distinguish it by the low and irreverent name of an obscure writing, which must be cleared up by internal light, and of a dead letter, which must be animated by the living spirit which exists in the soul. This is the cause of the complete indifference to all religion, which is commonly united with fanaticism. "Their mind," says a profoundly thinking historian, "which floats on the wide sea of inspiration, can be confined within no bounds; and therefore they permit to others also the same liberty." But however tolerant they may often be in religious matters, in their civil concerns they are equally cruel and barbarous. The supposition that they are immediately influenced by God in all their actions and undertakings, and that they think and act by his command, places them far above humanity, and blinds them to such a degree, that they exercise the most cruel tyranny, and shed in streams the blood of God's creatures and children, not only without any sensations of pity, but, on the contrary, with joy and triumph. That fanatics exhibit a wonderful firmness under sufferings and torments is known to every one, and has been frequently used by the enemies of Christianity, to detract from the firm heroic courage of the Christian martyrs. But the characteristic of fanatical firmness under torments, namely, that imprudent, inflexible obstinacy, and that insensible obduracy, which, in these cases, they constantly exhibit, has not been often remarked. If a person does not give himself the least trouble to represent to his tyrants, with modesty and gentleness the principles for the sake of which he is persecuted; but, on the contrary, answers those in authority over him either not at all, or with impertinence; if he reject all the methods which prudence would point out for avoiding his torments either wholly or in part, without violence to his principles, and if he rather solicit sufferings, who does not perceive that such a firmness under torments cannot proceed from a calm and rational reflection, and an heroic disregard of the world, but is the effect of a morose, unsocial obstinacy, and an inhuman obduracy; rather a paroxysm of frenzy than a praiseworthy firmness of mind? This paroxysm often increases to such a degree, that it produces even convulsive agitations of the body, and absolute madness; as we learn particularly from the early history of the Quakers. Such gloomy and morose persons, who consider the world with nausea and hatred, and have retired, as it were, back into themselves, in order to listen constantly to the suggestions of Heaven; who imagine that they are infinitely exalted above common humanity, and are the particular objects of the divine favour and care; such persons cannot certainly form a social, beneficent system of morality. Condemnation of all innocent indulgences; a solitary, selfish, gloomy, melancholy life; numerous fasts; rigid vows of celibacy; all possible avoidance of domestic and civil society; hostile hatred of the body and of the world; corporeal sufferings and mortifications; in short, a morose, unsocial, and barbarous severity, is the characteristic of a fanatic's system of morality.

---

[1] Fanatic, fanaticus, *εκστατικος, φανταστικος*, is one who acts only according to his sensations, and not according to the reflections of his reason. And this is the case, even when his sensations are true, agreeable to their objects; but still more so, when they are merely imaginary. A man may act fanatically in a variety of ways; for instance, if he be guided in his conduct by mere antipathies or sympathies, perform any thing only because he feels an internal excitement to it, imagine that he has seen angels, hears discourses from heaven, &c. But we must be very careful not to confound the fanatic with the sentimentalist, the man of feeling, (*ενθουσιαστης*;) the latter is a praiseworthy quality, the former a blameable.

It would conduct me too far from my purpose, were I to enter on a more ample development of this character. Whoever is acquainted with the history of the Montanists, of Mahomet, of the earliest Anabaptists, of Cromwell and his fanatical followers, of the Quakers and Jansenists, will be able to confirm the truth of each individual feature sketched above, by many examples from history.

From this picture of fanaticism cannot be selected a single, even the most trifling feature, which can be applied to the writers of the New Testament; on the contrary, they possessed traits diametrically opposite to every one of them. These men relate many great errors and faults which they had themselves fallen into: their strange ideas of the temporal kingdom of the Messiah; their inconstancy towards Jesus, whom they all deserted at his death; the rash and mad zeal with which Saint Paul persecuted the Christians; the reprehensible hypocrisy of Saint Peter. They make mean and humble descriptions of themselves; they attribute all their gifts and extraordinary endowments solely to the unmerited grace of God; they represent themselves as slaves, servants of the Christians, and as unworthy objects of the divine grace and beneficence, (1 Tim. i. 15, 16.) They speak, also, uniformly of themselves with equal reverence, modesty, and humility, (1 Cor. xv. 10; 2 Cor.) In their system exists the most perfect harmony. Saint Paul has never contradicted himself in his epistles, which he wrote at very different times, and addressed to very different communities and persons. The historians of Jesus have indeed some trifling discrepancies in the collateral circumstances of their narratives, (and this is an evident proof that they did not copy one from another;) but in essential matters they entirely and perfectly agree. And although scarcely one among them had read the writings of the others,[2] yet their histories and doctrines are perfectly concordant. The system itself, even those parts of it which treat of their inspiration, (1 Cor. ii.) is exhibited with such method, connection, perspicuity, and good natural understanding, that the most simple can understand it in its essential parts, and comprehend the sense of the writers.[3] In their writings they shew the greatest veneration for the written revelation of the Old Testament. They exhort their disciples to study it diligently, (2 Tim. iii. 14—17;) they pronounce it a truly divine revelation, and a binding rule of belief and conduct, (2 Peter, i. 20, 21;) and they point out its friendly harmony with the Christian system.[4] They invariably insist on this truth, that no other religion than that which they preached, can procure men so great and lasting happiness, (Acts, iv. 12; Rom. iii. 20—26.) But they make always a distinction between guilty and innocent ignorance and error, (Rom. i. ii. &c.) And thus reject all religious indifference on the one hand, and on the other all intolerant and anathematizing principles. In their sentiments and actions we remark the most meek, charitable, and benevolent temper. They earnestly forbid men to accuse others of heterodoxy, or to pronounce them damned, (Rom. xiv. 3—23;) they anxiously exhort to obedience of human ordinances, and the commands of the heathen magistracy, (Rom. xiii. 1—7; 1 Peter, ii. 13—17;) they direct that prayers should be offered up even for Nero, (1 Tim. ii. 1—6;) and their whole system of morals is directly pointed to instil into their disciples an universal, constant, disinterested, and generous philanthropy, (Rom. xiii. 8—16; Gal. v. 13, 14.) "I conjure you by all the good things, which Jesus has procured us; by the enlivening comforts which accompany charity; by the intimate connection in which you stand with one another; that you fulfil my only joy, and be unanimous, charitable, of one mind; do nothing with strife, and vain-glory, but in humility let each esteem others higher than himself; and be anxious not only for your own advantage, but also for the advantage of others. For you must have sentiments such as were the sentiments of Jesus Christ; who joyfully and voluntarily yielded up all his pre-eminencies and divine majesty for the advantage of men," (Phil. ii. 1—11.) Is this the language of a fanatic? Read only the thirteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, or the First Epistle of Saint John, and then say, whether such social and benevolent principles and sentiments could exist in the mind of a fanatic? Did ever a fanatic place philanthropy, that is, a philanthropy which consists in an universally extended, and universally active kindness, (1 Cor. xiii. 4—7,) above all his opinions, favourite doctrines, and especial gifts? or speak of it with such strong feelings and in such emphatic language? And this system of morals they not only enforced by words, but also by their example. They have never assumed a dominion over their disciples; never required what they directed in a commanding tone. Was it necessary for the welfare of Christianity to use severity? even this was marked with the characters of pity towards the transgressors, and of a paramount desire to increase the general good. And their whole life was a series of afflictions, tribulations, sufferings, and critical dangers, which they bore from a love to their fellow-creatures. Again, how infinitely different was their behaviour under sufferings, from the behaviour of a fanatic! They preached, indeed, their doctrines with ardent courage and undaunted firmness; but they no where courted sufferings. Are they persecuted in one city; they flee to another. Are they apprehended, and dragged before the seat of justice? they discover a profound reverence for the magistracy, return the desired answers to every question, declare the doctrines which they preached with becoming and modest boldness, refute the false accusations of their adversaries, and use every means, which prudence or foresight suggest, to conciliate their judges, and make them inclined towards them. And was all this ineffectual? could they not otherwise escape condemnation than by renouncing their religion; then, composed and courageous, with minds full of philanthropy and reconciliation, and pouring forth fervent prayers for the welfare of their enemies and executioners, they submitted to death. It is only such a serenity of mind, when the bitterness of affliction is felt, devoid of all obstinacy and contumacious disrespect for others, and suffering solely for the love of truth, that can be named heroic courage and firmness of mind. In their whole system of morals nothing is found of morose, gloomy severity. They pronounce mortifications and voluntary sufferings to be of no importance in the sight of God, (1 Cor. xiii. 3,) but rather folly and barbarous absurdity, (Ephes. v. 29; Colos. ii.) They know nothing of the monkish virtues of those who call themselves more modern Christians; of voluntary poverty, abstinence from matrimonial connections, avoidance of social societies, and rejection of temporal dignities and honours. They no where condemn the solicitation or possession of honours and wealth, or the enjoyment of the pleasures which this world affords: they only exhort Christians to use these goods of the earth with grateful hearts towards God, devoid of every unsocial act of impurity, cruelty, or excess, and for the welfare of mankind in general.[5] Can any maxims be conceived more suitable, more advantageous to the human race, than those which Saint Paul delivers? (1 Tim. vi. 17—19.) "Charge the rich of this world, that they be not proud; and that they place not their trust in perishable riches, but in the eternal God, who plentifully provides for our enjoyment of the goods of the earth. That they do good; be rich in good works; generous, and impart willingly; and thereby assure themselves of eternal life." And it is particularly worthy of remark, that they did not preach this most enlivening and comfortable system of morals, like Seneca or Plato, possessed of all the enjoyments of life, but under every species of tribulation and affliction.[6]

---

[2] Saint John, Saint Peter, and Saint Jude, are the only scriptural authors of whom it is probable that they had read the writings of the others before they composed their own works.

[3] Benson, in the Appendix to his Paraphrase of the Epistle to Philemon, in the first dissertation, "In which it is shewn that Saint Paul could neither be an impostor nor an enthuisast," has made some very excellent observations on the character of the apostle, which is so clearly expressed in the whole of the epistle,—how far he was removed from all ambition, pride, and selfishness; how compassionate towards human misery and weakness; how well acquainted with the modes of thinking and language of the polished world; how exempt from a solitary enthusiastic temper of mind. Read this epistle in the Paraphrase of Sir Richard Steele, in his Christian Hero. I could wish that some friend of the Christian religion would, with the same view, devote his attention to the consideration of the speeches of Saint Paul in the Acts of the Apostles, and unfold the connection, solidity, confidence, sublimity, and integrity, which are so very prominent in them. Such a work would be a convincing apology for the scriptural authors, in respect of their pretended fanaticism.

[4] Acts, ii. 14—36; xiii. 15—41; Rom. iv. 10, 19—21, &c.

The writers of the New Testament are, therefore, far removed from the pride of thinking themselves the especial favourites of God; they produce, with method and perspicuity, a connected, harmonious system of religion; they are great advocates for written revelation; they insist on the necessity of their religion, and condemn, indeed, all spirit of persecution, but at the same time all religious indifference; the central point of their system of morals, and of their conduct, is philanthropy, embracing and promoting the happiness of all; they exhibit under afflictions and torments a truly heroic courage; they censure all melancholy and gloom, recommend the use and enjoyment of earthly pleasures, and direct them to the noblest aim, the good of human society. They are, consequently, diametrically opposite to Fanatics.[7]

SECT. V.—THEY WERE, ON THE CONTRARY, MEN OF INTEGRITY.

The writers of the New Testament have given strong proofs of their integrity. I have already remarked,[1] that the style of their writings, and the choice of the events which they relate, contain strong arguments for their honesty. But it may be necessary in this place to extend this examination somewhat farther. In the historical books written by Jewish and heathen contemporaries, who were not Christians, many events of the Gospel history are confirmed. I will not delay the reader by proving, that every thing which the writers of the New Testament casually relate of the Roman emperors, Augustus, Tiberius, and Claudius; of the kings and considerable persons among the Jews; of the magistracies and customs of the Romans, Greeks, and Jews; of the civil rights and constitutions of the Jewish states; of the religious systems and opinions which then existed among them—exactly coincides with the information of foreign historians on these subjects. Lardner has discussed this subject in the first part of his *Credibility of the Gospel History*, with extraordinary labour, accuracy, and solidity.[2] It is sufficient for my present purpose to select from the great mass of events which he has produced, some of the principal, which either belong to the history of Christianity itself, or are intimately connected with it.

Of the taxing, (more properly, enrolment απογραφη,) which, according to Saint Luke, (ii. 1—5,) compelled the parents of Jesus to leave Nazareth, their place of residence, and go to Bethlehem, we find, indeed, no mention in foreign writers.[3] But the speech of Gamaliel, which is given us in the Acts of the Apostles, (v. 34—39,) makes mention of an enrolment, (v. 37,) which happened at the time when Judas the Galilean excited a sedition among the Jews. And in Josephus[4] we find, that after the banishment of Archelaus, Judea was made a Roman province, and an enrolment was appointed by Cyrenius, then president of

---

[5] Rom. xiii. 1—6; xiv.; 1 Cor. vii. 17—24; and in the whole of the 8th chapter; x. 27—33; 1 Tim. iv. 1—5.

[6] 1 Tim. iv. 1—4; vi. 17—19. Compare with 2 Cor. iv. vi. xi.

[7] See Lyttelton's *Conversion and Apostleship of Saint Paul*, in which this is proved particularly in regard to that apostle.

[1] See above, p. 9.

[2] In the second volume (first edition) of the *Credibility of the G. H.;* or the facts occasionally mentioned in the N. T. confirmed by passages of ancient authors, who were contemporary with our Saviour or his apostles, or lived near their time.

[3] The information itself of the evangelist is of very doubtful interpretation. It is uncertain whether he speaks of a taxation of the whole Roman empire, or only of the whole Jewish territory, (for γη may signify either *world* or *country*.) And the words ἀυτη ἡ απογραφη πρωτε εγενετο ἡγεμονευοντος της Συριας Κυρηνιυ, are translated by the commentators in three different ways,—1. This taxation was the first when Cyrenius was governor of Syria; 2. This taxation was made before Cyrenius was governor of Syria; 3. This taxation was the first of those which were made by Cyrenius (afterwards) governor of Syria. Lardner has treated most amply of this matter, *Credibility of the G. H.* part I. vol. ii. pp. 1—138, 1st edit. But what he asserts, p. 70, is very improbable, that the administration of the oath to the Jews, which, according to the information of Josephus, (*Antiq.* xvii. cap. 2, § 6,) happened at the time of Herod, is the same event as the enrolment of Saint Luke: that this assertion is unfounded, is evidently seen by comparing together the two accounts.

[4] *Antiq.* xviii. cap. 1, § 1, pp. 869, 870.

Syria; on which occasion a certain Galilean, of the name of Judas, excited the people not to submit to this order.[5] Let us compare the speech of Gamaliel, in the Acts of the Apostles, "After this man," (namely, Theudas, v. 36,) "rose up Judas of Galilee, in the days of the enrolment, and drew away much people after him." How exact and true is this narration! Saint Matthew relates (ii. 1—16) an action of King Herod, which, in respect to cruelty, has scarcely a parallel in history. He commanded all the male children in Bethlehem and the neighbouring country, who were a year old and under, to be put to death; because he had been informed, that in that place was born one who was King of the Jews. This appears to us, who are accustomed to the finer feelings of Christianity, almost incredible. But let us compare the character of this prince, as drawn by Josephus, with the above mentioned fact, and we shall find that his action is perfectly agreeable to his ruling sentiments and mode of thinking, and no more than we should expect from a man of a similar character. Herod had no common understanding and talents; but was biassed by an unlimited and insatiable ambition. This ambition urged him on to do every thing, without distinction, whether it were vicious, or had the semblance of virtue, which tended to gratify his ruling passion. Hence arose in his character that heterogeneous mixture of affable behaviour, splendid expense, tenderness towards his friends, and specious undertakings on the one side,—suspicion, rapaciousness, implacability, irreligion, inhumanity, and tiger-like cruelty on the other. He was resolute and daring in his undertakings; mild, conversible, and agreeable in his external behaviour; generous in matters which tended to the advantage, delight, or splendour of the public; and in outward appearance willing to do good to all. Yet this same man opened for himself a path to the throne by the murder of Antigonus and Hyrcanus, the only remaining princes of the Maccabean family; the latter, who was his near relation, and had saved his life, he assassinated with his own hand, and of the former he procured the death by means of bribery. He complied with the idolatrous worship of the Romans, plundered his subjects, and was suspicious and jealous of his best friends. Aristobulus, the brother of his wife Mariamne, was murdered by his directions, only because the people at Jerusalem shewed some affection for his person. Mariamne herself suffered a public execution, which was soon followed by that of her mother Alexandra. He put to death, in cold blood, a great number of the most considerable persons among the Jews; and even his own promising sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, were strangled by his orders, because he suspected that they might strive to obtain the sovereign power.[6] But the most horrible of all was the last action with which he departed out of the world, and from which he wished to establish another monument to his memory, and immortalize his name. In his last illness he commanded all the principal people of the nation to assemble themselves at Jerusalem, where he then lay. At their arrival they were shut up in the Hippodrome, and the dying king gave his sister Salome and her husband Alexas the following order, "As soon as the breath is out of my body, let them all be put to death, that all Judea may be compelled to lament at my decease." "With tears in his eyes," says Josephus,[7] "he conjured them by their love for him, and by their fidelity to God, not to refuse him this last honour." In such a ravenous beast in human form it was one of the smallest crimes,[8] if, deaf to the voice of pity and humanity, and unaffected by the innocence of the children and the poignant grief of their disconsolate mothers, he inhumanly dragged them from the arms of their parents, and put them to death with the ferocity of a tiger.[9] Saint

---

[5] *De Bello Judaico*, lib. vii. cap. 8, § 1, p. 422.

[6] Josephus, *Antiquit. Judaic.* lib. xiv. cap. 16, § 4, p. 737, edit. Haverkamp; xv. cap. 3, § 3, p. 745; cap. 6. § 2, p. 756; cap. 7. § 4—6, pp. 761—763; ibid. § 8, pp. 763, 764; xvi. cap. 11, § 6, p. 822. The last most painful illness with which Herod was afflicted, is pronounced by Josephus to have been a punishment of the just God for the crimes of the king, xvii. cap. 6, § 5, p. 845; and he concludes the account of his life with this painting,—*ανηρ ωμος μεν εις ϖαντας ὁμοιως και οργης μεν ἡσσων, κρεισσων δε τȣ δικαιȣ*, lib. xvii. cap. 8, § 1, p. 848. The Jewish ambassadors, who, after his death, requested the Emperor Augustus rather to make their country a Roman province, than to place it under the dominion of the Herodian family, affirmed, "that he had been a most cruel tyrant, and that the nation had suffered more through him alone, than it had during many preceding centuries." Jos. *De Bell. Jud.* xi. cap. 6, § 2. p. 156, Haverk.

[7] *Antiquit. Judaic.* lib. xvii. cap. 6, § 5, pp. 845, 846; *De Bello Jud.* lib. i. cap. 33, § 6, p. 141. A short time before the breath departed from his body, Antipater also, his eldest son, was put to death by his command, because, it being believed that the king his father was dead, he was about to take upon himself the succession. *Antiquit.* xvii. cap. 7, p. 847; and *De Bello Jud.* i. cap. 33, § 7, p. 141.

[8] The character of this miserable man, drawn by the hand of a master, is to be found in Sterne's Sermons.

[9] Although Josephus has not related this history, of which omission the cause is not difficult to be discovered, (see Lardner's *Credibility of the G. H.* part I. vol. ii. pp. 194—196, 1st edit.) yet the whole character which he ascribes to this Jewish king, is the most evident confirmation of the barbarous deed mentioned by the evangelist. Macrobius, a heathen writer of the fourth century, relates of Augustus, "Quum audisset inter pueros, quos in Syria Herodes Rex Judæorum intra bimatum jussit interfeci, filium quoque ejus occisum, ait, 'Melius est Herodis porcum esse quam filium.'" *Saturnal.* lib. ii. cap. 4. Now, although Macrobius is far too modern to be produced as a valid evidence in this matter, and his story is magnified with an erroneous circumstance, yet the cited passage serves to prove how universally notorious was the murder of the children in Bethlehem, which was committed by Herod's orders. Voltaire, either from ignorance and inconsiderateness, or from dishonesty, asserts, (*Diction. Philosoph.* article, *Christianisme,*) that fourteen thousand children must have lost their lives in this massacre. If this were true, the silence of Josephus would be truly a very important objection to the veracity of Saint Matthew's narra-

Matthew informs us, (chap. ii.) that Jesus had been in Egypt: and this is confirmed even by Celsus himself, who takes occasion from it to throw out the accusation, that he had there learned the arts of magic.[10] That Jesus was crucified under Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor in Judea, is likewise related by Tacitus.[11] The account of John the Baptist, who was unjustly put to death by Herod Antipas the Tetrarch, (Matth. xiv. 1—12,) is found also in Josephus.[12] The coincidence is remarkable. The Jewish historian relates that Herod had married his brother Philip's wife: and this very circumstance is asserted by Saint Matthew to have been the cause of John's execution. Immediately after he informs us, that the Jews pronounced the overthrow which Herod had suffered, to have been a divine punishment for his having slain John, who was surnamed the Baptist. *Κτεινει γαρ ταυτον* Ἡρωδης, *αγαθον ανδρα και τȣς Ιȣδαιȣς κελευοντα, αρετην επασκȣντας και τη ϖρος αλληλȣς δικαιοσυνη και ϖρος τον Θεον ευσεϐεια χρωμενȣς βαπτισμῳ συνιεναι.* "For Herod had put to death this man; a pious person who exhorted the Jews to practise virtue, to shew fidelity to one another, and reverence towards God, and with such hearts to come to be baptized." In exact coincidence are described the doctrines and behaviour of John by the Evangelists.[13] Saint Luke cursorily relates, (Acts, xviii. 1, 2,) that the Emperor Claudius banished the Jews from Rome: and Suetonius gives us the same account,[14] "Judæos," says he, "impulsare Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit."[15] The person whom Saint Peter raised from the dead at Joppa, was named Tabitha or Dorcas, (Acts, ix. 36:) and it appears from Josephus, that this name (which seems to imply something tender) was actually at that time in common use.[16] According to Saint Luke's information, (Acts, xi. 28, 29,) a great dearth prevailed throughout all Judea,[17] in the reign of Claudius; Josephus speaks of the same, and describes it as so terrible, that a great multitude of persons died of hunger.[18] The tragical end of King Herod Agrippa,[19] is related by Saint Luke (Acts, xii. 20—23) and Josephus[20] with so much harmony, that, had the latter been a Christian, one would have certainly believed that he intended to write a commentary on that narrative. This haughty monarch put off the Tyrians and Sidonians, who solicited a peace with him, until a certain day.[21] "And upon a set day[22] Herod, arrayed in royal apparel,[23] sat upon his throne, and made an oration unto them. And the people gave a shout, saying, It is the voice of a God, and not of a man![24] And immediately the angel of the Lord smote him,[25] because he gave not God the glory:[26] and he was eaten of worms,[27] and gave up the ghost."[28] Both historians relate the fact, as to the chief particulars, in the same manner. Saint Luke describes the pride of the king, as well as the nature of his illness, more circumstantially; and omits the superstitious addition of the owl,

---

tive; and with this view Voltaire makes the assertion, who always shews himself an inveterate enemy of revealed, and not rarely of natural religion also. But Bethlehem was a very small place; scarcely two thousand persons existed in it and in its dependent district. Now the male children alone were put to death; consequently in this massacre not more than fifty at most were slain. In the description of the life of such a tyrant, this was so trifling an act of cruelty, that it was but of small consequence in the history of his bloody government. See Büsching's *Harmony of the Evangelists*, i. 216, 217, of the original.

[10] See Origen's work against Celsus.

[11] *Annal.* lib. xv. cap. 44, p. 279, edit. Antwerp, 1607, fol. Nero put the guilt of the terrible fire at Rome, as Tacitus here relates, on the Christians. "Auctor nominis ejus," continues he, (namely, Christiani,) "Christus, qui Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat." The agreement of many more circumstances of this last suffering of Jesus with the accounts of foreign writers is shewn by Lardner in his *Credibility of the G. H.* part i. vol. i. p. 299 and following pages, 1st edit.

[12] *Antiq.* lib. xviii. cap. 5, § 1, 2, pp. 883, 884.

[13] Matth. iii. 1; ii. 5—10; Mark, i. 1—5; Luke, iii. 1—14.

[14] Vita Claudii.

[15] Comp. Lardner's *Jewish and Heathen Testimonies*, vol. i.

[16] See Ottii Animadversiones in Josephum, Oper. edit. Haverk. vol. ii. p. 313.

[17] Ὁλη *οικȣμενη* is sometimes used in scriptural language for a particular country only. See Lardner's *Credibility of the G. H.* part i. vol. i. p. 521 and following pages, 1st edit.

[18] *Antiq.* xx. cap. 2, § 6, p. 960; coll. cap. 5, § 2, p. 965.

[19] This Herod was the son of Aristobulus, and grandson of Herod the Great. By the favour of the Emperors Caligula and Claudius he was raised to the royal dignity, and almost all the lands which his grandfather possessed were by degrees bestowed upon him. Josephus, *Antiq.* xviii. cap. 7, § 10, pp. 896, 897; xix. cap. 5, § 1, p. 943.

[20] *Antiq.* lib. xix. cap. 8, § 2, pp. 650, 651.

[21] Josephus has not mentioned this particular circumstance. But he informs us, that the termination of the king's life succeeded a festal day, which had been appointed in honour of the emperor. From this circumstance we may conceive why Herod put off the ambassadors from Tyre and Sidon to that express day, namely, that he might shew himself with so much greater pomp to the people.

[22] Josephus determines it more particularly. It was the second day of the festival which was celebrated at Cesarea in honour of the emperor.

[23] A robe embroidered with silver, from which rays of the sun reflected a dazzling splendour, which set all the spectators in astonishment. Josephus.

[24] His flatterers (says Josephus, who prolongs this shout to an improbable extent) named him *a god*, and entreated him to be propitious to them, saying, "Heretofore we have honoured you as a man, but now we acknowledge that you are exalted above mortal nature."

[25] Josephus has inserted here a superstitious story, that Herod perceived an owl sitting on a certain cord over his head, and consequently held it to be an unfortunate omen. The fact itself he thus relates; that immediately afterwards the king was seized with a violent illness, and carried to his palace.

[26] The very same cause is assigned by Josephus, namely, because Herod had not punished the blasphemous flattery of the people.

[27] Josephus has not described the illness so circumstantially. The king, says he, felt violent pains about the heart and in the bowels. Saint Luke determines the cause more scientifically. The pain in the bowels proceeded from worms, by which he was eaten.

[28] After he had been continually tormented during five days by dreadful pains in his bowels, he expired. Josephus.

which is related by Josephus. A proof, that Saint Luke surpasses in fidelity, accuracy, and judgment even this learned historian of the Jews. When Saint Paul, in an uproar which the Jews at Jerusalem excited against him, was taken prisoner, the Roman Chiliarch, according to Saint Luke's relation, demanded of him, "Art not thou that Egyptian, who a short time ago, madest an uproar and leddest out into the wilderness four thousand murderers?" (Acts, xxi. 38.) Josephus explains to us this history, which Saint Luke has mentioned only casually.[29] An Egyptian[30] pretended, during the government of Felix, (consequently at the time mentioned by Saint Luke,) that he was a prophet; led with him into the wilderness a multitude of thirty thousand men; and marched against Jerusalem, promising, that the walls of the city should fall down immediately at his command; but was attacked by Felix, and escaped with a small part of his army. Of this remarkable harmony with foreign historians I will produce only two farther examples, and these on account of their opposite characters. Saint Paul, according to the Acts of the Apostles, (xxiv. 24, 25,) in his speech before the governor Felix and his wife Drusilla, discourses on the virtues of justice and chastity, and on the judgment hereafter to be holden on men for the violation of them. It must appear surprising to a reflecting reader why the apostle did not here speak on the fundamental articles of Christianity, on the resurrection of Jesus, &c.; and what reason could have induced him to select the above mentioned virtues in particular for the subject of his discourse. Tacitus and Josephus clear up this difficulty, and explain the cause. According to their information, the character of Felix is infamous, on account of the extortions which he had committed in Judea, and of the scandalous commerce in which he lived with Drusilla, the wife of King Azizus, whom he seduced and married, while her husband was still alive.[31] With this character the narration of Saint Luke is perfectly concordant. Saint Paul speaks before Felix and Drusilla of the judgments of God on injustice and unchastity. What could have been more terrible to such an audience? Felix trembled at the discourse! Nevertheless he held several conferences with the apostle, because he harboured the mean design of extorting money from him, (ver. 26.) What else could be expected from a man who lived in the public exercise of such violent injustice and adulterous marriage? This history in a twofold manner confirms the credibility of the scriptural writers; it shews how little Saint Paul suppressed the truth even when his temporal interest seemed to require it; and how accurately Saint Luke's narratives harmonize with the accounts of foreign historians. How honourable, on the other hand, is the conduct which Saint Luke (Acts, xviii. 14—16) attributes to Gallio, the Roman proconsul in Achaia! What justice, impartiality, prudence, and mild disposition shine forth in his answer to the accusation of the Jews against Saint Paul! "If it concerned an unjust or wicked action, reason would demand that I should support you. But as the contest concerns words, names, and your law, it is your own business. I will be no judge in such matters." And this agrees exactly with the honourable picture of him which foreign writers have drawn.[32]

Such a perfect coincidence with foreign contemporary historians in such trifling events, and in circumstances which are related only cursorily, establishes not only the authenticity of these writings, but is also a palpable proof of the integrity and credibility of their authors. Not less remarkable are the characters of the Gospel history, whom we find numerous and very distinct. The writers are evidently devoid of every species of art; yet the persons whom they introduce act so naturally and consistently, that we feel they are characters drawn from life. Pilate is convinced that the political accusations against Jesus are perfectly groundless; he attempts repeatedly to acquit him; yet not only against his own conviction, but even against his inclination, suffers him to be scourged, and even crucified: and all from the dread of being accused to Cæsar by the Jews. What a striking portrait of an unprincipled courtier! — who, moreover, (as was the case of Pilate, according to Tacitus,) had been guilty of many exactions, and therefore found it necessary to cover one act of injustice and cruelty by another. Judas Iscariot commits a crime of the foulest nature, he betrays his master, benefactor, and friend, for the paltry sum of a few pieces of silver. Notwithstanding the conciliatory, mild, and amiable warning of his Lord, he remains fixed in his barbarous determination, puts himself at the head of the murderers, goes boldly into the presence of his friend, and uses the most tender mark of friendship as the signal of treachery. The language of his friend, which might have been thought sufficient to have melted the most frozen heart, "Judas, betrayest thou me with a kiss?" even this does not make him alter his resolution. His conduct, probably, as we are taught by the event, was influenced by a hope, that his Lord would find means to liberate himself by those miraculous powers, which he had seen him so often exhibit. And when this expectation proved false, he proceeds to the magistracy of the Jews, confesses his crime, declares the innocence of Jesus, returns the money, and hangs himself. A frightful scene! But how well does it harmonize with the character of a covetous wretch as Judas was, according to the evangelists, and of a man who had been for some years a constant eye-witness of the ministry and actions of Jesus! A person of the finest talents could scarcely contrive a deceit so consistently; it was certainly totally impossible to one whose mind was devoid of cultivation, and whose employment from infancy had been the business of a fisherman.

---

[29] *De Bello Judaico*, lib. ii. cap. 13, § 5, pp. 177, 178; *Antiq.* lib xx. cap. 8, § 6, pp. 972, 973.

[30] Josephus also has no where given us the name of this impostor, but only spoken of him under the appellation of "the Egyptian."

[31] Tacitus *Historiarum*, lib. v. cap. 9, p. 428, edit. cit. Claudius ·· Judæam provinciam equitibus Romanis aut libertis permisit, e quibus Antonius Felix, per omnem sævitiam ac libidinem jus regium servili ingenio exercuit, Drusilla Cleopatræ et Antonii nepte in matrimonium accepta. The history of this Drusilla is related by Josephus more circumstantially. *Antiq.* lib. xx. cap. 7, § 1, 2, pp. 969, 970.

[32] Nemo mortalium uni tam dulcis est quam hic omnibus. Seneca, nat. quæst. l. 4. Tacitus *Annal.* lib. xv. extr. p. 290.

Saint Peter is involved in a crime almost similar. But the event is perfectly different. A look of his friend recalls him; and awakens the nobler sentiments of repentance, and confidence in the favour of his Lord. How accurately does this accord with the source of his crime, as given by the evangelist! He sinned not from an established and predominant evil inclination, but from temerity and inordinate passion. Among all the writers of the New Testament none use arguments drawn from the love of honour more copiously, no one warns against pride (1 Pet. v. 5, 6) more strongly, or exhorts more forcibly to heroic courage, than Saint Peter; this Peter, who is continually distinguished by the evangelists for resolution, heroic courage, and love of honour.

Saint John also at first deserts his Master, but soon returns, follows him into the palace of the high priest, accompanies him to the cross, remains there until he had expired, and takes upon himself the duties of a son towards the mother of his friend; and scarcely is the rumour heard that the grave is empty, but he is one of the first who hasten thither. We could expect no other conduct from a person who possessed a heart so tender, so sensible, and so truly affectionate towards Jesus, as is attributed to Saint John in the evangelical history.

Saint Thomas, after the resurrection of Jesus, behaves not less agreeably to his accustomed resolution, which degenerated almost to obstinacy. We see here the very same person who formerly, when all the others opposed Jesus' return to Judea, alone arose and encouraged his fellow-disciples, (John, xi. 16,) "Let us also go, that we may die with him.[33]

And, lastly, by what means were the apostles, unlettered fishermen, enabled to draw such a character as is the character of Jesus; since it has not a parallel either in the history of their own country, or of any other? Wherefore did they attribute, in particular, such mild, patient virtues to their Messiah, in whom the whole nation expected an enterprising and successful warrior?

Many farther proofs of integrity of the like kind may be found in their books. The writers of the New Testament discover the utmost abhorrence of the crime of deceit and dishonesty; and preach an integrity which does not allow men to utter even an indifferent untruth.[34] They deliver convincing proofs that they themselves possessed this virtue which they inculcate on others under the penalty of the divine wrath. They no where break out in their own praise; and when Saint Paul was under the necessity of relating his extraordinary endowments before the false apostles, with what timid modesty does he speak! (2 Corinth. xii.) They do not suppress even their own failings; they relate the astonishment and stupidity of the apostles at the discourses of Jesus, (Luke, xviii. 31—34;) the disgraceful infidelity which they manifested towards him under his sufferings, (Matth. xxvi. 56;) the denial of Saint Peter, (Matth. xxvi. 69—75;) his dissimulation at Antioch, (Gal. ii. 11—21;) the indiscreet and furious zeal of Saint Paul, (Acts, ix.; Rom. ix. 2.) They establish no separate sects. No one of them puts himself at the head of a party. On the contrary, they caution men most earnestly against all party spirit; and unanimously exhort them to receive and to reverence no other than the invisible Jesus as their only Head, their Teacher, and their Redeemer, (1 Cor. i. 10—16, &c.) They relate without disguise facts which evil-minded persons might easily pervert to the disadvantage of their history and doctrine; that, for instance, the disciples of Jesus could not heal a sick man, (Matth. xvii. 16;) that Jesus, during his passion, had endured violent sorrow and agony, (Matth. xxvi. 38, 39;) that he performed no miracles at Nazareth, (Mark, vi. 4, 5;) that on the day of Pentecost some of the spectators accused the apostles of drunkenness, (Acts, ii. 13;) that Paul and Barnabas quarrelled and separated, (Acts, xv. 39.) If their cause had been an imposture, they would indisputably have suppressed every thing of this nature. Again, the doctrines which they preached were directly hostile to the ruling taste of their times, and to the darling passions of all mankind: the overthrow of idolatrous worship; the abrogation of the Mosaic law; salvation through the mediation of one who had been crucified; the extirpation of all inordinate and extravagant appetites; a perfectly spotless and heroic courage. And the whole manner in which they exhibited their doctrines and history bears the visible stamp of the greatest honesty. Without any anxiety to prove the truth of their narratives; without any rhetorical arts to recommend them to others; without any artful and concealed obscurity, they mention their history as a matter which must be either known to all their contemporaries, or which could be examined and its truth or falsehood discovered without much trouble. The confidence and sure conviction with which they write is particularly apparent where they speak of the exercise of their miraculous powers. They relate these astonishing facts without any ornaments of language, oratorical flights, but with the most common expressions, and in the most concise and simple manner; when they speak of them, they bring to the remembrance of their contemporaries the artful religious deceits with which the heathen priests imposed on the people, and led them like irrational animals, (1 Cor. xii. 1, 2;) they appeal to these their supernatural gifts in opposition to those which they sharply reproved; and this, when addressing themselves to communities in which they had many personal enemies, (1 Cor. xii. xiv.; Gal. ii. 1—4.) In short, they speak with such certainty, with so much self-conviction, and with such confidence, of the truth of their history, that assuredly we can no longer confide in any historian whatever, if we entertain the least doubt concerning the honesty of the writers of the New Testament.

---

[33] See Secker's Sermons; and also Lardner on the internal marks of the credibility of the N. T. in the *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Rev. Nath. Lardner.* London, 1769.

[34] Rom. xii. 9; Ephes. iv. 25; 1 Peter, i. 22; ii. 21, 22.

SECT. VI.—THEY RELATE EVENTS WHICH HAPPENED IN THEIR OWN TIMES.

The writers of the New Testament relate their history at a time when it was almost impossible to have forged it. They inform us not of events which happened at the other extremity of the world many ages ago; as that a person perfectly unknown to posterity had, many centuries before their times, performed wonderful things in Britain. No, on the contrary, at Jerusalem they relate events which they assert to have happened at Jerusalem; events which took place in the times, and, in part, before the eyes, of persons who were then alive, (Acts, ii. 22—24;) events which tended to injure, and reflect dishonour on the principal persons in the city. These events they relate not in obscure corners of the town, in the presence of one or two insignificant persons: but in public places, in the schools of the Jews, before the highest tribunal of the nation. In the courts of justice of the Jewish kings and Roman governors they relate, that Jesus, who in the presence of all the people, and of the chief and most learned men of their nation, had proved himself by miraculous actions to be the long expected Messiah, had given to the human race the most noble and salutary doctrines, and led a most holy, innocent, and beneficent life, had been persecuted with ferocious cruelty by the chiefs of the people, until they brought him to the cross; that this same Jesus, nevertheless, a few days after his death had arisen, and had been seen at Jerusalem by many persons. This the apostles avow freely, publicly, and in the presence of men who flourished at the time they assert their history to have happened. They are thrown into prison, laid in irons, scourged, some of them put to death, and the others threatened with a similar fate. But not a single person arises to shew the falsehood of their narrative. They not only relate this *viva voce*, but also publish it in writings, addressed to places where considerable Jewish communities then existed; and at a time when they universally opposed the spread of Christianity with the greatest violence. Four men publish accounts of these events at different times. None of the succeeding historians would certainly ever have ventured to have laid them again before the public, if the narrative of the preceding had already been acknowledged false. And this their history is the relation of public and very interesting events, of a tendency no less important than the reformation of the whole existing world. A man must not only be deceived, or a notorious impostor, to utter falsehoods under such circumstances, but absolutely insane. We must, therefore, pronounce the writers of the New Testament either to have been out of their senses; or grant, that they did not forge their narrative, but, as to themselves, were perfectly convinced of its truth.

SECT. VII.—THEY APPEAL TO NOTORIOUS PROOFS.

Had they not been convinced of the truth of what they relate, but impostors, they would by no means have appealed to such proofs as depend only on the organs of sense, and which might have been easily examined by any, even the most simple person. In order to prove the truth of their history and doctrine, they do not appeal, like Mahomet, to secret visions of spirits, nocturnal journeys to heaven, or things which, as he pretended, took place in secret. They appeal to miracles which they had performed in the presence of their auditors, and in the midst of large communities. "My preaching among you consisted not in the subtile discourses of sophistry, but in proofs of the miraculous power of the Holy Ghost," (1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.) God has evinced that this doctrine came from him, through miracles and through a variety of miraculous gifts.[1]

---

[1] Heb. ii. 3, 4. See also 2 Cor. xii. 12; Gal. iii. 5; 1 Thess. i. 5.

And yet more—they assert that they had even imparted to their hearers the power of working miracles; that only by laying their hands on them they had enabled them to speak fluently foreign languages which they had never learned, to heal the sick by a mere word, and even to prophesy. "I, who have given you the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, and wrought miracles among you, have I preached to you the law of Moses, or the doctrine of faith?" (Gal. iii. 5.) "To one of you is given the gift of languages, to another the gift of healing sicknesses, to a third yet other miraculous powers," (1 Cor. xii. xiii.) Saint Paul appeals in the presence of large communities, at Corinth, a town of considerable consequence, and much frequented; in Galatia; and before Jewish converts, who were by no means well disposed towards him; before communities, in which were his most bitter enemies, who had actually formed themselves into a party against him; in epistles, wherein he gives them sharp reproofs, appeals to miracles which he had performed before them; and to miraculous gifts, which he had imparted, and which continued to exist among them. Still more than all this, he himself announces, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, a new miracle which he could perform, in proof of his divine mission, on an incestuous person, though at a distance, by inflicting on him a severe disease, (1 Cor. v. 3—5.) Now, in these cases, deceit or fanaticism is absolutely impossible. For, notwithstanding these circumstances, it would have been certainly impossible for the apostle ever to have persuaded the Corinthians, Galatians, and Hebrews that they could speak foreign languages, with which they in fact had no acquaintance; that they could heal the sick, whom they in fact could not heal; or that the incestuous person was fallen into a severe illness, when they knew him to be perfectly well. Saint Paul and the other writers of the New Testament, must have been absolutely out of their senses if they had spoken in this manner without foundation and truth. And supposing that they had done so, like the modern pretenders to inspiration, who in London promised to raise the dead to life; then the same effects would have followed in the former case, which happened in the latter. They would have been considered as visionaries and madmen, their religion as absurdity and imposture. Now as this did not happen, but, on the contrary, their persons and religion found such credit and extensive reception, this fact is therefore a perfectly convincing and incontrovertible proof—I might justly assert, of the historical certainty of their miracles, and of the divinity of their religion; but here I content myself with saying—of the entire credibility of these men.

SECT. VIII.—THEY HAD NOTHING TO EXPECT BUT TEMPORAL DISADVANTAGES.

And what was there which could have instigated them to forge these circumstances, and to propagate them with such perseverance? What had they to expect from their evidence? A miserable life; bitter railleries and scorn from the philosophers of their time; cruel persecutions from the Jews, from the heathen priests, merchants, and magistracy: for the history which they published must necessarily have appeared absurd to witlings and imaginary philosophers; and had a tendency not less important than the entire overthrow of the whole idolatrous worship of the Gentiles, and the abolition of the religion of the Jews. But, it may be urged, were not these consequences of their preaching unexpected? No: they themselves foresaw that their doctrine would be ridiculed by the philosophers (1 Cor. i. 23) of their time, and persecuted by the powerful with the sword and the cross, (Rom. viii. 35—39; 1 Cor. xv. 19.)

SECT. IX.—THEY SUFFERED FOR THE TRUTH OF THEIR NARRATION EVERY THING, EVEN DEATH, AND BROUGHT MANY OF THEIR CONTEMPORARIES TO THE SURE CONVICTION OF ITS TRUTH.

After all that has been said, should any suspicion of dishonesty still remain, it must instantly vanish when we reflect that these witnesses suffered so many afflictions and sufferings; such bitter and mortifying affronts; many of them the most grievous torments and the most painful death, with such composure and truly heroic tranquillity, for the sake of their evidence, and still continued to support it even to their last breath; and that by their testimony, they so certainly convinced a vast number of their contemporaries, who, without any trouble, could have proved the truth or falsehood of their history, that even these likewise sacrificed their temporal happiness and their lives to its truth. During the lifetime of some of them, that is, before the conclusion of the first century, numerous communities of Christians were already formed in all the three parts of the then known world. Their doctrine found great support in Asia, at Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Smyrna, Laodicea, Cesarea, &c.; in Africa, at Alexandria; in Europe, at Rome, the metropolis of the world, Corinth, Thessalonica, Philippi, and in many other great, civilized, and flourishing places.[1] These communities did not consist of merely low, mean, and ignorant people; but many great and learned men acknowledged themselves to belong to their communion. Among their first followers are found the Proconsul Sergius Paulus, (Acts, xiii. 7—12;) Dionysius, a member of the council of Areopagus, together with his wife, and many other Athenians, (xvii. 34;) several persons belonging to the court of the Emperor Nero, (Phil. iv. 22;) Erastus, chamberlain at Corinth, (Rom. xvi. 23;) some of the primates of Asia, (Acts, xix. 31;) and Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Hegesippus, Melito, Miltiades, Pantænus, Hippolitus Portuensis, Ammonius, and Origen, — men, of whom some were philosophers, and accurately acquainted with the best writings, and all the learning of the Gentiles.[2]

---

[1] See Benson's *History of the First Planting of the Christian Religion*, London, 1744, vol. ii. in 4to. Fabricii, *Salutaris lux toti mundo exoriens*, Hamburg, 1731, in 4to. in which is given a catalogue of those Christian communities which can be proved to have been planted in the time of the apostles. Among the first

All these persons lived at a time when, with inconsiderable trouble, and without the application of much learning, they might have inquired into the truth or falsehood of the Christian history. It deserves to be remarked here, that even in the third century persons were alive, who had communicated with the contemporaries of the apostles; and consequently might have derived the evidence for the truth or falsehood of those events from the first source. Saint John the apostle lived until the year of Christ 100. Polycarp, his disciple and most intimate friend, and who was personally acquainted with some of the other apostles, until 167. His disciple, Irenæus, who was in habits of intercourse with many of the immediate contemporaries and scholars of the apostles, lived until 202. Origen, the oracle of the Christians, who was celebrated about this time at Alexandria, and was connected with the most considerable Christians in Egypt and in almost the whole of the East, had consequently without doubt collected information on the Christian history from many persons, who, as well as Irenæus, had received their intelligence from the immediate contemporaries of the apostles. But the many thousands who became Christians in the first century were far better qualified for that inquiry: since Christianity was preached at a time when learning of every kind flourished under the government of the Romans; and received its origin in a country which at that period, through its governors and military concerns, had frequent intercourse with the Romans and with the most polished nations of the world.

These men, of whom some were distinguished by rank and learning, and all in a condition to examine into the truth of the Christian history with little or no trouble; who were educated in religions and customs (and who is ignorant of the power of custom and education?) which Christianity absolutely rejected; received this history, and embraced the religion, — a religion, which obliged them to change entirely their whole course of life, all their former actions and inclinations, (Ephes. iv. 17—24; v. 1—21;) which every moment endangered their goods, their consequence, and their lives. To this religion, which demanded nothing less than the sacrifice of all their former modes of thinking, customs, and darling passions; to this religion, I say, they were so devoted, and embraced it with so much zeal, that multitudes sacrificed to it all their comforts, wealth, peace, and consequence; and, which is still more, the love of their families: and, still confessing its truth, suffered steadily, and with a composure both tranquil and rational, the most horrible tortures, and the most painful death.[3]

Here, therefore, we have another and very forcible proof of the credibility of the writers of the New Testament. A number of men, consisting of many hundreds and thousands, among whom were several of considerable consequence and learning, arose and testified with admirable constancy to the truth of facts, which they had every opportunity of knowing and proving. And this their testimony is equally as weighty as if they had left it in writing, and that writing had been transmitted down to us. "For," to use the words of Butler,[4] "were a fact expressly related by one or more ancient historians, and disputed in after ages: that this fact is acknowledged to have been believed by great numbers of the age in which the historian says it was done, would be allowed an additional proof of such fact, quite distinct from the express testimony of the historian. The credulity of mankind is acknowledged: and the suspicions of mankind ought to be acknowledged too; and their backwardness ever to believe, and greater still to practise, what makes against their interest."

---

conversions none is more remarkable than that of Saint Paul, (Acts, ix. and xxvi. 1—23.) Lyttelton has shewn, in his *Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of Saint Paul, in a Letter to Gilbert West*, that this event cannot be attributed to the deceit of others, nor to the deceit or fanaticism of Saint Paul himself; but that it is true, and consequently an incontrovertible proof of the divinity of the Christian religion.

[2] See above, Part I. Book ii.

[3] See below, book ii. chapters 1, 2.

[4] Butler's *Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the course of Nature*, pp. 335, 336, edit. 1791.

BOOK II.

THE WONDERFUL ESTABLISHMENT AND PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY, IS A MOST CONVINCING PROOF OF THE ENTIRE CREDIBILITY OF THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, AND OF THE RELIGION WHICH IT ESTABLISHES.

CHAPTER I.

DESCRIPTION OF THE WONDERFUL PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

I. *Christianity spreads itself almost immediately over the whole world.*

It is truly astonishing how widely Christianity had extended itself almost immediately at its first rise. In less than fifty years numerous Christian communities had been established in every part, and in the most considerable cities, of the then known world.[1] The little seed was already grown up to a lofty and wide-spreading tree; and in the two following centuries it cast its beneficent shade continually wider towards the East and West. In the beginning of the fourth century the whole of the great and extensive empire of the Romans was filled with Christians, who held the most considerable employments in the state. The very courts of the heathen emperors contained men of scarcely any other persuasion. Under the persecution of Dioclesian, a whole city in Phrygia was burnt, because all the inhabitants had embraced that faith. Some of the emperors (as Maxentius, for instance) were obliged to spare the Christians on account of the people at Rome. It was this externally flourishing state of the Church, from the dissentions and vices which it occasioned, that became the principal cause of the terrible persecutions of the Christians in the fourth century.[2] Lastly, in the person of Constantine the Great, Christianity ascended even the imperial throne.

II. *It prevailed without the assistance of any temporal power.*

This rapid and successful progress was not effected by any human power. No prince, king, or emperor had adopted it; no sword was drawn in its cause; no armies took the field; no territories were conquered. It could neither procure riches for its followers, nor exalt them to employments of consequence. On the contrary, amidst poverty and obscurity, and entirely devoid of all temporal influence and greatness, did Christianity exist in the world until the fourth century. Instead of being supported and extended by earthly power and magnificence, it was rather obstructed by that very cause. Its exaltation to the throne was the epoch of its decline both externally and internally.

III. *Through thirteen poor, inconsiderable, unlearned, and almost unknown men.*

About thirteen men,[3] who were members of a nation despised by the Romans and Greeks; of the meanest extraction; brought up from their infancy in the employment of fishermen; formed in no schools of the rhetoricians; unacquainted with any part of the wisdom of the philosophers, or of the knowledge of the learned; abandoned, persecuted, hated by all, even by their relatives; these men arise, relate the history of Jesus, assert his resurrection and his numerous miracles, and on this foundation preach Christianity; and Jews, Greeks, Romans, and the whole world, embrace their doctrine.

IV. *Amidst the most dangerous internal disturbances and distractions.*

Many philosophers and scholars also became Christians. These men began in the second century, by introducing their fancies and errors, to deform the amiable simplicity of this religion; to obscure its splendour, and to diminish its strength. And now appear various heretics; this society, which had been most cordially united in the bands of love, is severed into numerous sects; genuine Christian virtue continually decreases; and superstition, fanaticism, and vice occupy its place. Thus, so early as the beginning of the second century, the Christian religion was compelled to struggle with dangerous enemies even in its own bosom!

V. *Under the most cruel external persecutions, and the opposition of the whole world.*

From without, if not more dangerous, yet more powerful and terrible enemies, united themselves against it. Christianity had an object no less important than the overthrow of the superstition of the Jews, and the idolatrous worship of the Gentiles, which comprehended the whole of the existing world. It was therefore opposed by all. The powerful and rich Jews, who were spread over every region of the Roman empire, at Jerusalem, in Palestine, at Damascus, at Alexandria, at Rome, employed all their power and artifice to extirpate the Christian name from the face of the earth. The apostles were many times scourged and banished; Saint Stephen stoned; the Christians expelled from Jerusalem; Saint James beheaded; Saint Paul chased from one place to another, imprisoned, scourged; and, in a word, the wrath of the Roman magistracy, together with the fury of the people, every thing was summoned up in order to choke the tender plant in its first shooting. Among the Gentiles religion was a part of their polity, and so interwoven with the state and civil government, that the governors and magistracy opposed any alteration of the established religion as strenuously as they would have resisted the overthrow of their own authority and the destruction of the state. These magistrates were also in general the priests of paganism. And where this was not the case, yet even there the whole body of the priesthood derived their subsistence from this imposture, obtained from it their high civil privileges, were very numerous and very powerful in the state, and stood, from the above mentioned causes, in the most intimate connection with the magistracy. The people blindly followed these conductors. Their education, and customs inherited from father to son, made the worship of idols a second nature to them ; and their vicious appetites could find nothing more convenient or more desirable than a religion which sold all the favours of the gods for sacrifices, incense, purifications, and similar corporeal ceremonies. They who were called philosophers at that time were so violently captivated with that to which they applied the term wisdom, namely, with their metaphysical fancies, sceptical follies, and rhetorical arts, that they set in motion all the powers of ridicule, and all the artifices of sophistry, to banish a religion from the world, which so simplified the whole system of wisdom, and established it in such a manner as to be comprehended by every capacity, and founded all the happiness of the human race on one that had been crucified. Thus, then, all that was powerful in the heathen world became most zealously hostile to the Christian faith. From the time of Nero, the emperors of Rome enacted laws, intended for the extirpation of Christianity. This tyrant commanded its followers to be sewn up in the skins of beasts, and these saturated with oil, to be lighted up by night for a public spectacle. But it was not the cruel Nero alone who persecuted the Christians ; even the mild Trajan, and the philanthropic Marcus Antoninus, ordered that they should be compelled by imprisonments and torments to renounce their religion.[4] In opposition to all these numerous and princely powers, in opposition to the whole Roman empire, were placed these poor unlettered fishermen, joined by a Paul, equally poor and inconsiderable ; and they not only defended themselves, but even conquered : overthrew the united subtlety and power of emperors, kings, governors, generals, merchants, sophists, and of the people ; and on the ruins of Judaism and paganism, founded the religion of Jesus ! It would have been apparently much easier for these thirteen men, alone and without any assistance, to have overthrown the whole Roman force, and to have placed themselves on the imperial throne.[5]

---

[1] See above, p. 60.

[2] See the beautiful extract from Eusebius in Dr Semler's *Hist. Eccles.* l. 100.

[3] See above, Part II. Book i.

VI. *And although exciting the repugnance of the human heart.*

But perhaps it may be said, they knew how to interest the sinful inclinations of the human heart in their favour ! Directly on the contrary, Christianity excites all these inclinations, without exception, against itself. And what is the power of kings and emperors, when compared with the enmity of the ruling passions of the human heart? The religion of the New Testament announces the most irreconcilable hostility to pride, ambition, vanity, avarice, revenge, impurity, and every other sinful, that is, universally injurious, inclination and appetite. It requires of its followers that they shall not possess any such appetites and thoughts even in their hearts. It requires that they shall practise invariably and universally an unqualified, unwearied, unrelaxed, and active philanthropy. It requires that they shall be cordially benevolent even to their enemies, and win and make them happy by acts of beneficence and blessings of every kind. It also requires us to sacrifice all our innocent pleasures and profits, in a word, all our temporal advantages, even health and life, to the general good of mankind, nay, of our most mortal enemies ; and suffer for their sake every kind of calamity, trouble, danger, and torment. It declares, that neither any *viva voce* confession of certain formularies, nor the exercise of any corporeal ceremonies, but that such a virtue as is grounded in the heart, which continually acts, and incessantly increases, is the only mean whereby we can obtain the favour of the Divinity, and the bliss of heaven. In this manner Christianity raised against itself the ruling passions of the human heart, and the whole world. And yet this small grain of mustard seed, as the author of our holy religion had many times prophesied, became a large tree, on whose branches the birds of the air lodged ; and grew up, like the seed which is sown, unobserved and rapidly, to the full grain in the ear.[6] Christianity converts millions in every part of the world ; and though exposed to continually increasing dangers, extends itself abroad ; and, lastly, at the present day is embraced and confessed by the tenth part of the human race.[7]

---

[4] See Franc. Balduini *Ad edicta vett. principum Romanorum de Christianis*, Moshemii *Institut. Hist. Eccles. maj.* et Ruinarti *Præf. ad acta Martyrum.*

[5] See Lyttelton *On the Conversion and Apostleship of Saint Paul*, and Jortin's *Discourses concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion*, pp. 87—116 of the second edition.

[6] Matth. xiii. 31—33 ; Mark, iv. 26—29.

[7] Robert Millar's *History of the Propagation of Christianity*,

CHAPTER II.

THAT THE OLD WORLD WAS INTOLERANT.

Voltaire boldly asserts,[8] that the Gentiles in general, and particularly the Romans, were by no means intolerant. "Nothing," he exclaims, "was more social than the heathen religion. The Romans permitted the exercise of every religion, and considered religious tolerance as one of the most salutary laws of the state. This monster, this pest of the world, Intolerance, is a daughter of Christianity!"

SECT. I. — OF THE EGYPTIANS, GRECIANS, AND ROMANS.

I. Not to mention the old Persians, who destroyed all the statues in the temples of the Egyptians and Grecians; nor the Carthaginians, who were in the utmost degree jealous of the service of the gods of their state, what do these adversaries of Christianity think of the incessant civil wars among the Egyptians? One province of the country waged war on another, because the latter worshipped the ox, the dog, the wolf, the cat, and other brute beasts, as gods, whilst the former slew and consumed them! What of that established law of the country, which condemned to death the person who should destroy one of the animals to which divine honours were paid? A Roman, as Diodorus relates, who was himself an eye-witness of the fact, had accidentally killed a cat, and was immediately put to death by the enraged people. From a similar cause, the inhabitants of the city Ombi became engaged in a quarrel with those of Tentyra, which was conducted with so much violence, that the Tentyrans cut to pieces on the spot a citizen of Ombi, who had been taken prisoner, and ate him still reeking with blood.[1]

> Summus utrinque
> Inde furor vulgo, quod numina vicinorum
> Odit uterque locus, quum solos credat habendos
> Esse deos, quos ipse colit.
>
> JUVENAL, *Sat.* 15.

II. If this be called tolerance, the Grecians were also tolerant in a very high degree. At Athens, every citizen swore an oath, that he would acknowledge the religion of the country, and defend it against every other. Certain laws forbade men to dispute concerning the gods, or to dishonour them, under very heavy, and in some cases, mortal punishment;[2] and their severity was felt by many of the most worthy men. Protagoras was driven into exile, because in his writings he had merely called in question the existence of the gods, and his works were publicly burned.[3] Anaxagoras, the first who taught among them the doctrine of one supreme Being, was condemned to death because he named the sun, which the Athenians worshipped as a divinity, a burning fire.[4] And every one knows the fate of the greatest of all the philosophers of antiquity, who, on account of his purer and excellent doctrines concerning God and providence, was compelled to drink the poisoned bowl. His disciple also, the noble Plato, who has so affectingly described the martyrdom of Socrates, even he gives, under the laws of the wise state which he describes, this command, — Let the calumniators of the gods be first reproved, and if that be of no avail, let them be punished, even with death.[5] And this was the ruling sentiment of all Greece, as is clearly evinced by what are called the holy, that is, the religious wars. At the time of Pericles, the Athenians waged war on the Lacedemonians, because they had, in common with the Phocians, the superintendence of the temple of Apollo at Delphi.[6] At another time, a similar religious war was the pretext for Philip of Macedon to subjugate Greece. The Phocians had appropriated to themselves a field dedicated to Apollo at Delphi. The council of Amphictyons pronounced them on this account guilty of sacrilege, adjudged them to pay a certain sum of money, and on their refusing to pay it, war was solemnly proclaimed against them, in which all Greece took a part, and which continued with great violence during the space of ten years.[7] And who is ignorant of the cruelties and terrible torments by which Antiochus Epiphanes wished to compel the Jews to sacrifice to idols, and to renounce their paternal religion?

III. But among the Romans, we are told, intolerance was unknown; all sects enjoyed under them the most perfect liberty of conscience and religion. Yet was it one of the fundamental laws of the state, (of the XII Tables,) "Deos peregrinos ne colunto;" and Cicero, one of the greatest orators and lawyers, reckoned it among the most necessary laws of every wise state, "separatim nemo habessit deos, neve novos: sed ne advenas, nisi publice

---

London, 1731, 2 vols. in 8vo. contains much useful matter, particularly respecting the missions of Christians into heathen countries; but it is only a compilation from well known books, it cannot always be depended upon, not is it by any means complete. The reader will find in Fabricii *Salutaris lux Evangelii toti orbi Exoriens*, in 4to. an account of the writers on the history of Christianity.

[8] Traité de la Tolerance, Si les Romains ont été tolérans.

[1] See Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, and particularly Juvenal's 15th Satire, in which he paints the superstition and intolerance of the Egyptians, and relates that horrible history which took place in his time.

[2] Strobæus *De Repub.* Serm. 41, Petiti Leg. att.

[3] Cicero *De Nat. Deor.* i. 23.

[4] Diogenes Laertius, ii.

[5] De Legibus, x.

[6] Plutarch in Pericle, Thucyd. i.

[7] Diodorus Siculus, xvi.

adscitos, privatim colunto."[8] When, in the year of the city 326, a great drought and infectious disorder raged, superstition so far attained the superiority, that on every side were seen new gods and new forms of divine service. The government, therefore, enjoined the Ediles to be vigilant, "Ne qui nisi Romani dii, neu quo alio more quam patrio colerentur."[9] In like manner, under great disasters, the state was purified from foreign religions.[10] Mæcenas advised the Emperor Augustus to forbid not only atheism, but also all foreign divine worship, both from religious and political principles. "Worship," said he to him,[11] "the gods yourself, and compel others to do the same. Abhor all those who would make any innovations in religion, and punish them. Suffer no atheists, magicians," &c. Tiberius expelled from Rome all who were devoted to the Egyptian, Jewish, and in general, to any foreign divine worship.[12] Four thousand of these men were, merely for the sake of their religion, sent to Sardinia to fight against the robbers, "si ob gravitatem cœli interiissent, vile damnum," and all the rest were chased out of Italy.[13] I have already spoken of the hard, and in part cruel, persecutions of the Christians. Even the mild Trajan commanded Pliny to execute the Christians.[14] Not only the Romans, but also the Grecians, and in general all idolaters, readily adopted foreign idolatrous worship: it was, in fact, a part of their religion; for they imagined that every nation, and every affair in the world, had its peculiar god, and believed themselves to be safe in proportion to the number of the gods that they worshipped. But with so much greater severity did they persecute all foreign religions not established by the state, and more particularly the Christian, because it condemned all idolatrous worship, and all slavish adoration of the emperors. The laws, customs, and sentiments of the Egyptians, Grecians, and Romans, put this matter beyond all doubt.

SECT. II. — THE DOCTRINE OF CHRISTIANITY ON THIS SUBJECT.

Christianity was the very first system of religion which introduced among men an unlimited, enlightened, and charitable toleration of all who professed religious articles different from its own. It is true, that the Mosaic law tolerated strangers, without compelling them to embrace the Israelitish religion: but they were obliged to renounce the worship of idols; and every idolater was punished with death, — a severity which was rendered necessary by the existing situation of the world, and the vices, and cruelties, and assassinations, inseparably connected with the idolatrous worship of the times. The New Testament here also extends and exalts virtue. No man, according to its laws, shall be despised on account of his religious opinions, be they ever so absurd and injurious; still less shall he be stigmatized by mortifying and calumniating appellations; and least of all, condemned and pronounced incapable of the favour and bliss of God. It commands, farther, that Christianity shall not be pressed on any heretic, and least of all through corporeal means: that those appointed for that purpose shall explain the Christian religion to him with sound arguments and mildness, but leave the choice entirely to his own judgment: that above all, the Christian shall desire and hope for the salvation of every man whose religious sentiments are erroneous, even though he be a contemner of religion or an atheist, love him as cordially as he would a believing brother, act with benevolence and beneficence towards him, and pray to God for his happiness.[1] That in this manner the Christian shall on the one side avoid and flee from every error, abominate in particular those which are pernicious to the general welfare, consequently, most of all, errors in religious concerns, and labour, on the contrary, with all earnestness and zeal after truth, particularly in religion, the highest concern of man. On the other side, he shall be attached with brotherly love to him who errs, is deceived, or led into sin, recommend to him at proper opportunities the truth with firmness and fervency, endeavour to win him by every action of kindness and beneficence; but give up to his own judgment the perfect liberty of choice. Such a tolerance, absolutely unlimited, and purified from all indifference towards the truth, is taught, and indeed was first taught, by Christianity! Intolerance, on the other hand, is, according to its principles, not only to afflict men with civil punishments on account of mere matters of religion, to compel them to renounce their religion, or to put them to death for the sake of it; but also, to refuse residence in a country, together with the free exercise of their religion to religious societies, whose tenets are not pernicious to any principles of civil right, and, in short, to withhold from any one, simply on account of his articles of faith. those charitable services which are in our power. And this intolerance, according to its doctrine, is sin, (Rom. xiv. 23,) a renunciation and dishonouring of Christianity and its fundamental principles, (Luke, ix. 52—56,) is the destruction of one of its essential laws, the love of our brethren, (1 Tim. vi. 1—6,) and even a crime against the injured majesty of God, (Rom. xiv. 1—13.) When, therefore, as early as the fourth century,[2] men, who bore the name of Christians, began to persecute those who differed in religious opinions from themselves, and to consider and to punish what they called heresy as a civil crime; when Augustine placed this religious persecution among the Christian doctrines; when men, in the eighth century, began to propagate the Christian religion (as they erroneously named it) with fire and sword; when, shortly afterwards, the term *Heretic* became a magic word which transformed thousands of men into tigers; when we read of the Christian crusades against heretics and unbelievers; and when, lastly, the inquisition became established in the very bosom of Christendom, that most terrible of all tribunals, which, nevertheless, was named *the holy*, and in the name of Christ and of God murdered, burnt, desolated—

---

[8] De Legibus, ii. 8.

[9] Livius Histor. iv. 30.

[10] Livius Histor. ix. 30; xxv. 1; xxxix. 16, Quoties hoc patrum avorumque ætate, negotium est magistratibus datum, ut sacra externa fieri vetarent, omnem disciplinam sacrificandi præterquam more Romano abolerent?

[11] Dio Cassius, lib. lii.

[12] Suetonii, *Tiber.* i. 36.

[13] Tacitus *Annal.* ii. 85.

[14] Plinii Epist. lib. x. ep. 97; Cornelii Van Bynkershoek *opuscula, De cultu religionis peregrinæ apud vet. Roman.;* et Jo. Dan. ab Hoven *Compensia, Fascic.* i. p. 33, s.

[1] Matth. x. 13; John, vi. 66—68; Rom. xiv.; 2 Cor. i. 24; iv. 2, 3; and other places.

> Tristius haud illa monstrum, nec sævior ulla
> Pestis et ira Deûm stygiis sese extulit undis: —

who can lay these abuses, or even the least part of them, to the charge of Christianity? Sooner might we reject all the arts of medicine, because ignorant pretenders to skill in that science have robbed men of their health and lives; sooner condemn all civil society, because tyranny, riot, and anarchy have often arisen out of it; sooner call reason, that preeminent quality of man, the pest of humanity, because the Alexanders, Cæsars, Neros, and Buonapartes use it for the devastation of the earth, — than call Christianity intolerant on account of the abominations of such disgraces to humanity, who apply to themselves its name! Christianity, which first introduced among men a tolerance as unlimited as enlightened and charitable!

CHAPTER III.

PARALLEL BETWEEN THE PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY, AND OF THE RELIGION OF MAHOMET.

Thus Christianity established itself in the world, never persecuting, but incessantly persecuted; under various difficulties from within; and infinite oppositions, persecutions, and cruelties from without; entirely through itself, through its own doctrines and laws: and spread itself over every part of the globe!

It is true, the religion of Mahomet likewise extended itself with most astonishing rapidity and facility over the face of the earth. Scarcely had ten years elapsed since his flight from Mecca, (the Hegira,) when he had brought all the tribes of the Arabians under the yoke of his religion and sovereignty; and a short time afterwards his religion had swallowed up the numerous and flourishing churches in the East, overflowed the West, and was become the terror of united Christendom. This event is truly astonishing; and the enemies of Christianity have not failed to make use of it as an argument to shew that there was nothing miraculous in the extension of the religion of Jesus.[1] But in this they have either not known, or have anxiously suppressed, the connections and means of assistance which favoured Mahomet, and which leave nothing wonderful in the success of his doctrine. Mahomet came into the world exactly at the time proper for his purposes. Religion in Arabia Felix, the paternal country of his new system, was then in the most deplorable state. The inhabitants of the country were divided into four religious parties. Some of them were devoted to the idolatrous worship of the Sabians, who adored the stars as divinities; and others to Zendicism, or the idolatry of the Magi, who worshipped fire. The Jewish religion had a great many followers, who treated the others with much cruelty; and the Christians who were resident there at that time, formed principally an assemblage of different heretical sects, who had taken refuge among this free people, because they were not tolerated in the Roman empire. Under such a distracted state of religion, it would have been highly wonderful if Mahomet had not procured in a short time a numerous train of followers. The Christian religion, on the contrary, received its origin in a country where the only true God was worshipped, and the Mosaic law (which it abrogated) universally revered. The political state of the world at the period when Mahomet appeared was uncommonly favourable to a new conqueror. The western part of the Roman empire was then overflowed by the Goths; and the eastern so weakened through the Huns and Persians, that it could resist no vigorous attack; without taking into consideration the absurd superstition, the horrid contests, and bloodthirsty spirit of persecution, which had then almost entirely extinguished Christianity. In the Persian empire existed ruinous internal commotions, which were excited principally through the impious doctrine of Manes, and the desolating principles of Mazdack, who, a short time before the appearance of Mahomet, had given himself out for a prophet, and introduced a community of wives and of property. But at the time of the apostles, the power of the Romans was still in its meridian height, and had united almost the whole globe under its sovereignty.

---

[2] See above, p. 21.

[1] Boulainvilliers, *Vie de Mahomed, avec des reflexions sur la religion Mahomedane, et les coutumes des Musulmans.* Amsterdam, 2d edit. 1731, in 8vo. p. 442.

Again, Arabia was very populous; many Jews and Christians had taken refuge there from other kingdoms where they had been persecuted by the prevailing sects. The Arabians were a free people; not devoted like other nations to the extravagances of lustful pleasures, but temperate and hardy, and therefore properly qualified for new conquests. This brave people was at that time divided into separate tribes, who were all independent, and connected with one another in no political union: a circumstance which uncommonly facilitated the conquests of Mahomet. Mahomet himself was descended from a family of much power and consequence; and by a marriage with an opulent widow became one of the richest men in Mecca. He was endowed with fine and politic talents; and from the various journeys which he made in his mercantile concerns, had acquired a perfect acquaintance with the constitution of the country. He compounded his new religious system out of all the four prevailing religions of Arabia. From the idolatry of the Sabians and Magi he took the divine celebration of Friday, and of the four months in the year; the pilgrimage to Mecca, together with different superstitious fables concerning the resurrection of the dead and the last judgment. From the Jews he borrowed many tales, particularly concerning angels; numerous purifications and fasts; the prohibition of certain kinds of food, and of usury; the permission of polygamy and of capricious divorce. From the Christian sects he derived a variety of doctrinal tenets, as well false as true, concerning the divine decrees; the authority of Jesus and of the evangelists; the resurrection of the body; the universal judgment of men; together with many moral precepts. Thus he united by this mixture all the four religions of his paternal country, and thereby procured a more easy admittance for his new doctrine. Farther, he established his religion in such a manner that it did not excite against itself the passions of men, but on the contrary flattered them in various ways. According to his system the sum of religion consisted in the performance of certain corporeal ceremonies —purifications, the recital of certain prayers, alms, fasts, and pilgrimages to Mecca. It was truly much easier to perform these than to restrain lusts, to suppress all sinful appetites, and to confine those which are innocent within their proper bounds. He attributed such a value to these mechanical ceremonies, that he supposed atonement to be thereby made for every crime and every sin. Such a doctrine, so extremely accommodating to the sinful passions of every kind, together with the permission of polygamy and capricious divorce, and the promise of a full enjoyment of gross, sensual luxuries in a future life, brought more men under his subjection than could have been effected by a moderate army. And lastly, Mahomet was not so much a prophet as a soldier. He endeavoured to propagate his religion not through arguments, he did not address it to the understanding; but he appealed to arms, and made it a fundamental law of his religion[2] to wage incessant war against unbelievers; and, should they refuse either to become Mahometans, or to purchase a freedom of religion from the hands of the faithful, by the payment of a certain tribute, to decide the matter with the sword.

Under such circumstances it would have been a phenomenon most wonderful, and at variance with the whole analogy of history, if the doctrine of the prophet of Arabia had experienced an unhappy, or even a less fortunate fate. But that an history, and a religion founded thereon, which was diametrically opposed to all the modes of divine service that existed at the time of its origin, and could be established on nothing else but on their ruins —which demanded from its followers, under the punishment of eternal misery, a perfect change in the whole train of their thoughts; a detestation of all unchaste pleasures, fornication, adultery, polygamy, wanton and dissolute divorce; the absolute avoidance of all ambitious, covetous, and avaricious projects and concerns; and which placed the essence of the true worship of God not in visible ceremonies, but in a pure, humble, philanthropic, and truly virtuous mind:—that a religion, which was supported by no powerful men, but was preached by thirteen poor, despised, and illiterate persons; that this religion, without any the least possible assistance of worldly power, without any active compulsion,[3] but, on the contrary, under the greatest oppression, afflictions, and torments of its supporters, should have prevailed over the whole nation of the Jews and the united power of the Romans; should have acquired in a few years many thousand followers; soon afterwards spread itself into the farthest parts of the North and West; and lastly, should have subjected even kings and emperors, together with the greatest and most civilized nations—this is an event which has not its parallel in all history; and can by no means be explained, without calling to our aid a most extraordinary support of the Almighty.

After what has been said, it is almost incomprehensible how Lord Bolingbroke could object against the Christian religion, that it had produced no effects worthy of a divine origin. What kind of effects is then demanded? "If the revelations," says Bolingbroke,[4] "which have been pretended, had not been pretended only, the necessary consequence would have been, that the system of religion and government would have been uniform through the whole world." And why? "Because the divine Omnipotence[5] would have imposed it on all mankind, so as necessarily to engage their assent." But God never acts in this manner in the government of the world, as far as we are acquainted with it. He has given us, as Bolingbroke confesses, a natural revelation of his will, since he has connected with certain modes of conduct either salutary or pernicious consequences, and bestowed reason on man to enable him to discover them. And yet it is evident, that he does not compel men to comply with this revelation. Religion cannot operate like a charm or a medicine; we may study and practise it or not. Agreeably to the moral nature of man, it produces no effects otherwise than through the understanding. And admitting that God had intended to compel men by his omnipotence to the practice of a certain religion, of what use then would have been an immediate written revelation. Either, therefore, there is no immediate written revelation of God; or the very existence of such a revelation proves, that it is God's will to deal with us, not according to his omnipotence, but in a moral manner, and to leave it entirely to our free will, whether we will follow what he has clearly revealed or not.

---

[2] See the Koran, ch. 9.

[3] I speak here of its first propagation.

Indeed, the opponents of Christianity labour to destroy the miracle of its propagation, by producing a variety of natural causes, through which they endeavour to explain it. But the greater part of these pretended causes are forged; and even if we unite them all together, this event remains incomprehensible, unless we take into the account a higher support. 1*st*, What they say, in the first place, of fanaticism, is amply refuted in page 51. 2*d*, The pretext of universal tolerance under the Jews and Romans is evidently contradictory to history.[6] 3*d*, And the same may be said in answer to the assertion, that the first supporters of the Christian religion were exclusively simple and mean people.[7] Bolingbroke has chosen still another mode. He supposes this to have been the cause of its rapid and extensive progress, that the apostles used the artifice of receiving into the pale of Christianity all, without exception, both Jews and Gentiles.[8] But what assistance could that give to a religion which afforded not the least temporal advantage, but, on the contrary, placed its first supporters in danger of losing every thing they possessed in this world, nay, even life itself? Suppose a poor despised man, who could scarcely find support for himself, were to publish a declaration, that he would receive every one without distinction into his service, is it probable that a single person would be induced to enter into it? Another assertion, that a community of property was introduced in the earliest ages of the Church, is stated as a most powerful cause of the propagation of Christianity.[9] Should we grant, as his lordship pretends, without any foundation, and in opposition to history, that such a common stock existed in the primitive church, this very circumstance would have rather hindered the rich and powerful from embracing the religion. But the assertion is evidently false. Such a community of property existed only in the beginning, and indeed only in the parent community at Jerusalem, (Acts, v. vi.) The converts from paganism, who composed the far greatest part, were restrained from leaving their former condition and calling, (1 Cor. vii. 17—24, 30, 31; Tit. ii. 9, 10,) that through their diligence they might obtain support for themselves, and a trifle for the assistance of the necessitous, (Eph. iv. 28,) but were by no means allowed to afford nourishment to the indolent, (2 Thess. iii. 6—12.) And the apostles themselves followed this precept; they never once permitted the communities to maintain them, but themselves procured their own support, (2 Thess. iii. 7—9.)

Once more: — When we thus observe Christianity arising in the world, continuing and extending itself during eighteen hundred years, continually wider and wider; when we see that neither the idolatry, superstition, and infidelity which surrounded it on all sides; nor the united power of the world, which sought to extirpate it; nor the heretics who deformed it; nor the wretches who betrayed it; nor even its unworthy followers, who, particularly since the fourth century, scandalized it by their vices; nor, lastly, time, the great destroyer of all human things, have ever been in a condition, I will not say to annihilate, but even to alter it, — we cannot but recognize the traces of a superior Providence — we cannot but acknowledge that the inexplicable propagation of Christianity is a seal of the truth of the history of the New Testament, and, I dare pronounce, of the divine origin of its religion!

A SUMMARY RECAPITULATION, AND CONCLUSION OF THE CREDIBILITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Thus, by the calm and temperate language in which the writers of the New Testament relate their history, we become prejudiced in their favour. They do not declaim on Jesus, they deliver over him no panegyrics; but they let him act and speak. And they inform us of his actions, particularly his miracles, in the most simple manner, without any laboured ornaments, without any rhetorical amplification, and without any enthusiastic eulogies, nay, without even any calm explication of what is great and supernatural therein. They are related with a striking simplicity, exactly like the most general and commonplace circumstances.

---

[4] Works, vol. iv. p. 224.
[5] Ibid. vol. v. pp. 261—267.
[6] See above, p. 64.
[7] Ibid. p. 61.
[8] Works, iv. p. 306.
[9] Works, iv. p. 422.

These authors, as we have seen above, had every necessary qualification in order to know with certainty the truth of what they relate. We cannot discover in them a single spark of fanaticism. It is impossible that they could have been deceived in that of which they inform us; and still less were they deceivers: they who published their history on the spot and at the time where and when it happened; whose narration is in part remarkably confirmed by foreign authors; whose writings contain in themselves so many clear traces of truth; who oppose every kind of deceit in their doctrines and actions; who, from their preaching, had no temporal advantages to obtain, but, probably, all to lose; who, lastly, even sacrificed to their doctrine, rest, civil honour, and life. The character of these men is evidently the most noble and most amiable; open-hearted and honest in their instructions, mild and tolerant towards those who thought differently from themselves, serene and social in common intercourse, affectionate towards their friends, generous towards their enemies—they undertake a life composed of pure fatigue and difficulties, and suffer contempt and torment, in order to promulgate a history and religion built thereon, which they considered as the greatest blessing of the world; and their preaching is attended with the most wonderful effect. They are therefore not only credible, but they are so in a greater degree than Tacitus—they are credible evidences in the highest of all possible degrees. So that either there is absolutely no immediate revelation from God, or it is contained in the writings of the New Testament.

THE END.

EDINBURGH:
Printed by Andrew Shortrede, George IV. Bridge.

RTheol
M

Memes, T. S., ed.
Christian Treasury.

9829

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET